School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1416655

PURITAN PRINCIPLES AND AMERICAN IDEALS

HENRY HALLAM SAUNDERSON

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

SEA
200

PURITAN PRINCIPLES
AND
AMERICAN IDEALS

Books by Henry Hallam Saunderson

PURITAN PRINCIPLES AND AMERICAN IDEALS

CHARLES W. ELIOT: PURITAN LIBERAL

PULPIT AND PARISH MANUAL

THE POWER OF AN ENDLESS LIFE

THE LIVING WORD: THE BIBLE ABRIDGED

67
S25

PURITAN PRINCIPLES AND AMERICAN IDEALS

HENRY HALLAM SAUNDERSON
AUTHOR OF "THE WAYSIDE PULPIT"

THE PILGRIM PRESS
BOSTON CHICAGO

COPYRIGHT 1930
SIDNEY A. WESTON

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE PLIMPTON PRESS · NORWOOD · MASS.

THIS BOOK
IS DEDICATED *TO*
R. V. S.
WITH ABIDING
GRATITUDE
AND
AFFECTION

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

FOREWORD

In surveying the Puritan movement and estimating its political effects, we go back not merely to the time, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth of England, when the word Puritan was first used, but to an earlier time. Early in the thirteenth century the English barons faced their obstinate sovereign, King John, and forced him to sign the Magna Carta. Within the same century the English House of Commons was created, in recognition of the principle that, as the common people had to bear a large part of the burden of taxation, they were entitled to a share in the government of the kingdom. They saw clearly, even in that far-off time, that if the people were to have justice they must have a measure of self-government.

Five centuries separate the date of the creation of the House of Commons in England and the date of the calling of the Continental Congress in the English colonies in North

America. These two events were of great importance in the development of constitutional government among English-speaking people. When the Continental Congress was called into being, men were asserting the ancient English principle that "taxation without representation is tyranny." The Continental Congress was a provisional government which carried to victory the War of the American Revolution. During that war came the Declaration of Independence; and after it the creation of the government of the United States of America.

In the course of the development of the power of the House of Commons in England, the time came, more than three centuries ago, when the word Puritan was applied to the progressive party in English politics which was striving to promote constitutional government. Decade after decade the members of that party were able to elect a majority in the House of Commons. They were the advocates of every humane movement of the time. As the established Church of England was co-extensive with the nation, they sought to purify that church of every inheritance of mediævalism.

The religious motive was dynamic in the Puritans as they sought for political reforms.

Three centuries ago, while the Puritans were in a bitter contest with King Charles I over the rights of the English Parliament, they undertook also the creation of colonies in New England, in which they made significant experiments in constitutional government. These experiments had a determining influence on the future history of the North American continent. The humane and progressive principles of the Puritans were expressed in the organization of the government of the American Republic. What the Puritans did in their New England colonies, created in turn the ideals of the Republic.

Few lines of development in world history are as significant as that which begins with the signing of the Magna Carta and leads on to the ratification of the Constitution of the United States. That line of development traces the progress made by English-speaking people in many experiments in government, which found a double justification in the triumph of the English Parliament and that of the American Congress. This book traces that

line of development and interprets the political aspects of the Puritan movement. To the genius of the Puritans, the American Republic owes its essential spirit.

H. H. S.

CONTENTS

I. The Puritan Migration . . 1

II. Pioneers of Democracy . . 11

III. The Power of Puritanism . 35

IV. England and New England . 53

V. Creative Principles of the Puritans 83

VI. Dealing with Dissenters and Delinquents 121

VII. Colonial Governments — Local and Central 163

VIII. Sources of Puritan Culture 193

IX. Dynamic Ideals 217

X. Creating a New Nation . . 233

Chapter I

THE PURITAN MIGRATION

On the morning of Saturday, the twelfth day of June, in the year 1630, the ship *Arbella* passed Cape Ann and sailed into Salem Harbor, after a voyage of more than two months from England. She was a little ship, bearing a small company of people and their simple possessions, the principal person on board being John Winthrop. No physical fact concerning the voyage of the ship would indicate that anything important was happening; yet the event is pivotal. The people on board the little ship had ideas which they wanted to put to the test. They had chosen a place for this test — an area on the New England coast, between the vast Atlantic and the unknown extent of the American wilderness. They hoped for sufficient time and such measure of freedom as would permit the test to be made thoroughly and earnestly. They wanted to experi-

ment with education, government and religion; but principally with religion. The *Arbella* was one of many ships which, in a decade, brought twenty thousand people from England to the colony of Massachusetts Bay. This great migration was the expression of ideas which had been growing in power through centuries; the outcome no man could have predicted. Results vastly greater than could then have been dreamed have come of that migration. The consequences of the test were very different from what these adventurers had hoped for or imagined; their ideas have influenced profoundly the history of the North American continent.

Having dropped anchor in the outer harbor on Saturday, the *Arbella* lay waiting idly over the Sabbath day, and on Monday, against adverse winds, was brought into the inner harbor. On Thursday John Winthrop set out on an exploring expedition along the coast and, for short distances, up the little rivers, to choose a place suitable for "a fortified settlement." More than one party was engaged earnestly in this important search, which required weeks. Some consideration was being given to a place

on the bank of the Charles River, where Harvard College was afterward located. The *Arbella* sailed into the mouth of the Charles River as far as Charlestown, where the ordnance and other supplies were landed.

Ten other ships of the fleet which had sailed about the same time as the *Arbella* arrived in June and July. Important decisions of great urgency had to be made and vast labor performed. Town sites had to be selected, trees felled, land cleared and houses erected. The summer was waning and the winter, with its extreme hardships, was approaching. Before the end of the year 1630 the immigrants numbered probably fifteen hundred. Many of the people were ill from disease contracted on shipboard. They had lost some of their horses and cattle during the voyage. A serious amount of their supplies had been ruined. Some of the people spent the first winter housed only in canvas.

Many persons, including some of importance in the expedition, died as a result of the hardships on board the ships and after landing. Some were discouraged and returned to England when the ships sailed for home. Coura-

geous and hardy must have been those who endured the hardships and continued loyally the great adventure of founding the new colony and building its first towns. If the major object of these adventurers had been economic gain, there would have been little encouragement in the early years of struggle, privation and hardship; but they had the moral qualities which have marked those people who have contributed most to the progress of American ideals.

The history of America has not been primarily the story of the exploration of the continent and the development of its physical resources. It has not been primarily the rivalry of races, their conflicts, and the great decisions which have determined which race should be dominant in the New World. It has not been primarily the organization of states and nations and governments. All of these have been elements in this history, adding to its great romance; but America has been primarily the proving-ground of ideals, and American history has been the progress of these tests.

Three centuries ago, history dramatized the

greatest problem of all time: the question of the worth of human personality. Through all ages the powers inherent in human life have sought opportunity for development and expression. That endeavor has given to American history its greatest significance. The French, in the early years, took possession of the mouths of the two most important rivers on the North American continent: the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi. Pushing their way toward the sources of these great rivers, they seemed destined to come together in the great central valley and to dominate the continent; but history decided otherwise. The French transplanted the feudal system to American soil, and their dominance would have changed greatly the type of American institutions.

There was a conflict in ideas even in the English colonies on the American coast. Two decades before the coming of John Winthrop and his little fleet of ships and his company of Puritans and his charter, on which a new government was to be founded, an English ship had brought a cargo of African slaves to Virginia. There the ideas of the Cavalier were

expressed in government and in commercial and social institutions. In the far south the Spanish gold-seeker was endeavoring to gain a permanent place in the New World.

The economic theories of rival races and classes is not of supreme importance in these early movements for possession of American soil; of greater significance was the value placed on human life, and the confidence or lack of confidence in the powers inherent in human personality. The feudal system, traces of which may still be found among the French in Canada, allowed the overlord to own the land and the service of the men who tilled the soil. In the Spanish settlements the government was primarily for the advantage of the governing class. In the southern English colonies, human slavery took deep root and flourished. In the Puritan colonies of New England there was an earnest endeavor to conduct government for the welfare of the whole population; to provide education for all the people; and to develop the spiritual, social and mental powers of men by the practical use of those powers.

It is not necessary to overlook the faults of

Puritanism to see that in the adventure of the Puritans of New England was a repetition of the great experiment of history: the testing of the worth of the powers of human personality. The Puritans created town governments and every town was a school in self-government. Men learned to do by doing. The Puritans created churches which emphasized the capacity of men for direct individual experience of the Eternal; and the government of those churches was like the government of the towns. The Puritans endeavored to guarantee a scholarly ministry for the guidance of the people, and also to provide education for the children of the whole population and books for every home.

These religious, governmental and educational institutions were not for economic advantage nor for military supremacy. They were expressions of the Puritan faith in the powers of human personality. With the coming of the twenty thousand people who joined in the Puritan migration to New England between 1630 and 1640, a new era was begun in this age-long hope of men for self-government.

History was preparing the setting for a new drama, but it was the old problem of the welfare of human beings. The stage was being set for the working out of that drama — a stage of magnificent dimensions, in keeping with the importance of the problem to be decided. The front of the stage was the sweep of the Atlantic coast from Newfoundland to Florida. As explorers pushed westward, the curtains of mystery were lifted, and the stage was deepened. The scenery of the stage was infinitely varied: little streams and great rivers; hills and mountains; fields and forests. The characters on the stage were picturesque: the feudal lord and his serfs, the slave and the slave owner, the gold-seeker, the fisherman, the farmer, the woodsman — the pioneers of many trades and occupations.

Among these many figures on the stage is one of great importance: the New England Puritan. Somber in appearance, austere in manner, serious in thought and speech, he yet possessed ideas which were to be of vast influence. When a written drama is acted on an artificial stage, the actors know the end of the play from the beginning. But in this Ameri-

can drama the play was created even while it was being enacted. For three centuries it has continued, and the end is not yet. Generation after generation, the people of the other nations of the world are the interested spectators; for on the progress of this American drama depend the hopes of the whole human family.

It has been estimated that about one fourth of the population of the United States are descendants of the people who joined in the Puritan migration to New England. Exact figures are impossible in such estimates; but of greater importance is the fact that Puritan ideas have influenced the form of the American government and the institutions of every State in the Union. The essential ideals expressed in the democracy of town government, in popular education through the public schools, and in spiritual development through self-governing churches are ideals which have influenced, in some degree, all the people of the nation. Time has shattered the formal patterns which the Puritan chose for his town, his school and his church; but American history has justified magnificently the faith which led him to create these institutions for the

development of the powers of human personality.

Sometimes it is said, by people who look only at the surface of life, that the Puritan stock is dying out and that Puritan principles have perished. On the contrary, if some of our most careful historians are to be trusted, we have at least twenty-five million Americans today who can say with truth, "My ancestors came to New England in the great Puritan migration." That stock will not die out while the nation endures. Puritan principles, expressed in decisions made in the New England colonies, and wrought into their governments, appear on a more magnificent scale in the government of the American Republic. Even the language, in which Puritan leaders expressed their principles, appears again in the immortal documents which are the foundation of this nation. These principles are imperishable, for they have become the ideals of millions of people in this and other progressive nations.

Chapter II

PIONEERS OF DEMOCRACY

When the Puritans came to New England, there were some things which they were careful to bring and other things which they were careful to leave in England. It is highly significant that they brought the Bible but did not bring the Book of Common Prayer. That they regarded themselves as loyal sons of the Church of England adds to the importance of their choice of books. This was no minor or temporary choice, but was the result of a conflict continuing through many years. To them the Prayer Book meant conformity, which they resisted; but the Bible meant religious and political progress, to which they were devoted. The search for the origin of this contrast takes us back to the times of Wyclif, "the morning star of the Reformation."

Three centuries before the momentous voyage of John Winthrop to New England, there

was living in Yorkshire, England, a lad about ten years old, John Wyclif. The exact date of his birth is unknown, but it was probably 1320. In due time and after adequate preparation, he was sent to Balliol College, in Oxford University. Here his brilliant mind was revealed, and he was ranked as one of the greatest scholars of his time. Appointed to a teaching position in Oxford, his lecture room was crowded, for he had a gift of interpretation which drew young men to him. In the field of philosophical disputation he was acknowledged supreme, and he received a doctor's degree in recognition of his unusual attainments.

Had he kept within the field of philosophy, his influence might have extended little beyond academic circles; but theology and the interpretation of the Bible interested him intensely. His studies and his teaching led him to the declaration of the conviction that the Bible, not the Church, is the supreme authority in the Christian faith. He worked out an original system of theology, which he believed to be justified by Scripture, but which was at variance with the theology of the Church.

The Church in England, at that time, was the Church of Rome. There was much religious confusion and restlessness, for the Roman Church had lost the confidence of the English nation. The Papal Court was at Avignon, on the border of France; and there was sharp enmity between England and France, which led, in the near future, to bitter warfare. The unhappy strife within the Catholic Church had reduced its influence everywhere. There was widespread corruption in the Church in England, and little hope of its purification. One reason for this was that the Church in England had no corporate existence. Even the friars were responsible directly to the Pope and were not subject to the bishops in England.

Many of the higher clergy were foreigners, some of them not even residents of England. The Church of Rome regarded England principally as a source of revenue. Even the common laws of England regarding justice and morality could not be enforced against evildoers among the English clergy; for they were subject to the Roman Canon Law and could also claim "benefit of clergy." Not even the

ecclesiastical courts in England could enforce their laws, for a final appeal could be made to Rome; and the bishops in England could not purify their church of its iniquities.

It has been estimated that, at that time, nearly one fourth of all the arable land in England was owned by the Church; and the complaint was made (in 1376) that the taxes levied by the Pope on the English nation were five times as much as those levied by their own king. Men looked in every direction for some hope of relief but saw none on even the distant horizons. The Church had a strangle hold on the nation, as it had on other European nations. The doctrine of transubstantiation was no mere theological or ritualistic phrase. It was the teaching — accepted generally — that in the Mass the priest worked the miracle of changing the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. This miracle was the very heart of the plan of salvation, and the Church had a monopoly of the power of working the miracle. Since all men stood in need of salvation above all other needs, they must receive what only the Church could bestow, and upon her own terms. In mediæval times

this right of the Church was not seriously questioned.

Wyclif, when past middle life, became a reformer in addition to being an inspiring teacher and a popular preacher. He had the courage to deny those essential doctrines on which the strength of the Church of Rome depended. He denied utterly the truth of the doctrine of transubstantiation and the authority of the Pope. He declared that the authority of the Pope was derived from the Cæsars of Rome and not from Christ or Peter. In his preaching he pictured the Christian church as he believed it ought to be from the teaching of the Bible. He poured out invectives against the greed and immorality prevalent among the ecclesiastics in England as elsewhere.

Of course he was accused of heresy, and the Pope ordered his imprisonment pending an ecclesiastical trial. Oxford, however, had long been notable for asserting English liberties and resisting the claims of the Pope, and now denied the right of the Pope to order the imprisonment of an Englishman. So powerful were the friends who rallied to Wyclif's aid that no trial took place, and, for a time,

the reformer continued his work with increased influence. Many men in high position in the kingdom would have been glad to loosen the hold which the Church had upon the resources of the nation and rejoiced that the greatest scholar of the age had revealed a rational ground for denying the supreme authority of the Church.

But Wyclif's greatest genius was revealed not in his relations with scholars and statesmen but in what he did in his later years for the whole population of the kingdom. During these years, besides his lecturing and his labors far and wide as a popular preacher, he was the rector of the parish church of Lutterworth. He had great confidence in the value of normal human intelligence, and this confidence he expressed in an original way.

In addition to his other labors he produced a scholarly and altogether admirable translation of the Bible into English. It had been one of his hopes that the service of the Church might be taken out of Latin and put into English. Without waiting for any such reform, he organized an order of preachers to make the people of England familiar with the

Bible in their own tongue. He wanted to carry his argument to the tribunal of the intelligence of the common people and determined to open to his fellow countrymen the greatest source of religious instruction and spiritual inspiration of the world: the Bible. Wyclif is described as a man of austere habits, commonly going barefoot and clothed in a reddish-brown habit. His preachers went out in similar garb. They accepted poverty not only as a condition of their labor but as a rebuke to the Church, which demanded so much from the nation and bore so small a part of the burdens of the national life.

This was long before the invention of printing; but, with infinite patience, men made copies of Wyclif's edition of the Bible. His tracts, too, of which he produced an amazing number, were copied. With such precious literature his preachers went out to read the Scripture and expound it, and to instruct the people in truth and righteousness. Wyclif had no intention of breaking away from the Church of his time, and indeed he continued his work at Lutterworth till he dropped dead in the midst of his activities. Like John Wesley who, cen-

turies later, lived and worked and died within the fellowship of the church of his own land, Wyclif did a great evangelical work, and, in his own heart, was loyal to what he believed his church should be.

In appraising the work of Wyclif, the historian may recall the influential positions which he held, the arguments in which he participated, the great bulk of his literary labors, his scholarly achievements, and his influence among scholars and statesmen, an influence which extended far beyond his native land. His theological position was progressive, his scholarship illuminates a shadowy time, and his reforms had tangible results. But the greatest single element in his life and work, surpassing all else in its far-reaching consequences, was his faith in the capacity of plain men. In this he anticipated the major principles of modern democracy and was a prophet of American ideals.

The most stringent repressive laws and the most bitter persecutions could not wholly undo what Wyclif did in his lifetime; and his organized preachers, continuing his work after his sudden and untimely death, changed the face

of the life of England. In his work with the scholars and politicians he dealt with problems of major importance: the seat of authority in religion, the relations of the Church to the State, the major means for propagating the Christian religion, the place of the greatest religious literature, the Bible, in the development of life. Suddenly to turn to the common people with these problems, confident of approaching by a surer road their solution, was the act not merely of a scholar and statesman but of a prophet. It required great audacity and sublime faith to take this step. Serious dangers were involved in it and, incidentally, vast confusion came from it. His prophetic vision could not be justified in his own generation, nor for many generations; but he saw the truth which rests beneath the greatest problem of all human history. That problem is the development of the powers that are inherent in human personality. The exploration of the earth's surface, the study of the universe, the development of the material resources of mines and fields and forests and streams, the mastery of land and sea, — these are lines of progress through human history. But they are

of secondary importance when compared with the development of the powers of the inner life of the race. Every other gain is to be measured by its effect on the gains of human personality, and the goal of all progress is the attainment of the most dynamic life.

Education, government and religion were influenced powerfully by Wyclif's work. The prevailing principles before his time made education the privilege of the few, permitting autocracy in government, and giving to the priestly party of the Church a monopoly of the means by which men might hope for salvation. Wyclif produced a *Book* and with it appealed to the common people. His preachers were teachers. They did not merely instruct in the dogmatic spirit which was so common; they did not demand that the people take a merely receptive attitude toward the instruction offered. They read the Bible aloud to individuals and groups of individuals, appealing to them to know the contents of the Book, to understand it and to *interpret it* for themselves.

Beyond this instruction imparted immediately, was the slow patient work of the educa-

tion of the common people of the kingdom. The means of education did not exist but had to be created. Copies of the Bible and parts of the Bible and of Wyclif's tracts had to be made by hand, and the common people could not reward such scholarly labor. Yet men left their positions in Oxford to take up the work of Wyclif's messengers; and, from many sources, the ranks of that army were recruited. The most serious obstacle to a nation-wide work for education was that England lacked a common language. There were many dialects, but no one tongue was recognized as the language of the nation or was understood by the majority of the people. Wyclif's Bible and the work of his preachers gave England a common language and magnified the sense of nationality. To acquire a knowledge of the language of this Bible was, for thousands of people, like learning a foreign language. Indeed there were some mutterings of criticism that Latin, which they did not understand but which was familiar to their ears from its use in the Mass, was preferable to the strange language of this unfamiliar Book which this heretic and reformer was sending out.

Wyclif's work was thus a great educational movement, developing the intelligence of a large proportion of the population of England. It was also, in a new way, a religious movement; for it taught men to find a path into the immediate presence of God without waiting for the priest to open the wicket gate or to collect his fee. Men learned a new way of prayer, of worship, of aspiration. They entered into a thrilling spiritual experience, the direct contact of their spirits with the Eternal Spirit. Their horizons were widened as they learned to love the literature of another race and of a far-off age; but imagination brought them very close to the visions of the Hebrew prophets, the presence of Christ and the hopes of the apostles.

The work of Wyclif had far-reaching results, not only in education and religion but also in government. A little more than a century before his birth, the feudal barons of England had faced their tyrannical King John and required him to sign the Magna Carta, which was the very foundation of constitutional government for the English-speaking nations of later times. Decades of turmoil followed as

King John's successors sought to evade the provisions of this immortal document. But a half century after the signing of the Magna Carta, the English House of Commons began its real existence. Here was the recognition of the right of the common people to a voice in their government, since they bore a large part of the heavy load of taxation. It is an impressive fact that just five hundred years later, on American soil, English-speaking men were protesting against unjust taxation by a blundering English king. They were declaring that "Taxation without representation is tyranny," and were arming themselves for the war of the American Revolution.

The English House of Commons had only a small influence in its beginnings; but in the next hundred and fifty years it came to a commanding position in the government of England, and no laws could be passed or taxes levied without consulting this body which represented the common people.

During that important century when the democratic spirit in England was developing the power of the House of Commons, Wyclif and his followers were doing pioneer work in

the education of the people. They were developing deep religious feeling in the men who were remaking the government. This was prophetic of the power which Puritanism was to have in later times through the union of the desire for political progress with the driving force of a great revival of religion.

It is difficult for us, in modern times, to appreciate fully what these pioneers of democracy accomplished. To make England a land of one language instead of many discordant dialects; to lead the people to think nationally instead of locally; to develop in the people their latent capacity for progressive action — these were creative achievements. When we read that Wyclif denied the reality of transubstantiation, we may think that this was merely a matter of mediæval theology. Wyclif's denial was made from a sincere religious conviction, but the issue involved the greatest financial problem of England. When we recall that the Pope was drawing from England a revenue five times as great as was paid to the English king, we realize something of the magnitude of the problem. Wyclif's denial of this doctrine loosened the Pope's hold on the finan-

cial resources of England. Thus Wyclif's influence was strongly against autocracy in Church and in State. It is always more difficult for autocrats to hold in subjection a people when they have gained a measure of education and their minds are winning emancipation; and it is doubly hard to repress their movements for liberty when they have been swept by the fire of a religious revival. Thus did Wyclif's work for education and religion have a powerful effect on movements for an added degree of political freedom for the common people of England.

Many of his preachers taught radical social doctrines and stirred up discontent. There were serious riots and revolts of the peasants. England experienced a serious upheaval; and every one, from sea to sea, felt the effects of the new ideas of the rights of the common people. The immediate effect was the suppression of revolt by military force, the passing of severe restrictive laws and the infliction of heavy penalties. But England was changed, and the conservative men of Church and State could not restore the old order of things. Wyclif had opened a gate on the road

that led toward human freedom, and that gate no man could close. Progress along that road might lead through privation, imprisonment and martyrdom, but men pressed forward with indomitable will. As long as Life produces human personality and packs it full of latent power, so long will men seek the opportunity for the development of that inner power and be restless under the sting of its impulses. Men must find the ways of using fully this power in education, in religion and in government. History is the story of men's gains and losses and lasting achievements in this eternal quest.

One of the first weapons employed against Wyclif and his preachers, whose footpaths wove a net over all England, was the easily forged weapon of ridicule. They were nicknamed " Lollards," the name being the equivalent of " idle babblers." Men of the Church expressed not only their opposition to the work of Wyclif but their utter contempt for the common people of England by saying of his translation of the Bible that he had taken their pearl of great price and had cast it before swine, to be trodden in the mire. With pic-

turesque exaggeration men said that anywhere that two men were seen talking together it might be assumed that one was a Lollard. Of Wyclif's doctrines it was said that every sparrow twittered about them from the eaves. Ridicule and opposition strengthened the devotion of the simply garbed and barefoot preachers. Little is known of the means by which they gained the bare necessities of life, but enough is known that we are sure they lived in extreme poverty.

The story of Wyclif's life does not really seem to end when he was stricken in the chancel of his church in Lutterworth in 1384 and died suddenly at the height of his influence. It is as if martyrdom still awaited him. Richard II was then king of England, and it was through the patronage of his first queen, Anne of Bohemia, that Wyclif's works were carried to her native country where they were like good seed sown in fertile soil. John Huss and Jerome of Prague became leaders in a movement resembling, in spirit, the Lollardry of England. For five centuries the Hussite movement has been powerful, in spite of bitter persecutions, wars, revolutions and poverty.

Probably at no time in the entire history of the Roman Catholic Church has its influence been so weakened and its authority so seriously questioned as at that time. Rival popes were enthroned in Avignon and Rome, and excommunicated each other. Corruption, immorality and worldliness among the higher clergy, and the mercenary spirit widely prevalent in the Church, threatened to smother the spiritual life. A great council of the representatives of the whole Church was called to meet in the city of Constance in June 1414. For months its deliberations continued in the endeavor to solve the problems of the Church.

Though hundreds of scholars, clergy and statesmen attended the council, John Huss has had a greater and more lasting influence than any other. Here he was charged with heresy, tried, condemned and put to death. On the sixth of July the men of the council and thousands of other spectators gathered in a broad meadow to see the heroic reformer as he was chained to an iron stake and burned. Thus did the council attempt to annihilate one of the greatest influences of the age for the promotion of the spiritual life of men.

The council knew well that from Wyclif had flowed the inspiration for the spiritual revolt in Bohemia, and it condemned his works as heretical. Huss was a lad of twelve years when Wyclif died, and the line of spiritual succession was easily traced. One of the malign consequences of the Council at Constance was that, in 1428, men dug up the remains of Wyclif and burned them in the endeavor to stigmatize his name and influence with the condemnation of heresy in extreme form. How blind and frantic and futile were such plans! Huss was immortalized by his martyrdom; Wyclif lived again as if his spirit rose mightily from the flames. In order that nowhere on earth should any spot be known as the resting-place of the ashes of Wyclif, men swept clean the place of this insane burning and cast the dust and ashes into the nearest river. And so the simple stanza was written, —

The Avon to the Severn runs,
  The Severn to the sea;
And Wyclif's dust shall spread abroad
  Wide as the waters be.

Two centuries later his spirit was impelling men as they began the great migration of the Puritans to New England to found a new government in the New World.

It was in the drastic attempt to suppress the political, educational and spiritual influences of Lollardry that the statute books of England were first stained with a law that prescribed burning at the stake as the penalty for heresy. In 1399 Richard II was succeeded by Henry IV as king of England. The most serious problem of the new king was that of dealing with the unrest associated with the work of the Lollards. There were scholars who opposed popular education, the Church was frantic because of the influence of Wyclif's heresies and the propagation of the Bible and his tracts, and the aristocracy was greatly troubled by the revolts of the peasants. The common people were thinking vigorously for themselves; they were developing a spiritual life outside of the Church; and they were declaring themselves to be worthy of more influence in government and entitled, by the laws of justice, to a larger share of the products of their own labor.

Determined to make his place upon the throne more secure, Henry IV sought the influence and support of the privileged classes and the Church. He promised to carry forward a vigorous persecution of the Lollards. To this end the Statute of Heresy was passed in 1401, two years after he ascended the throne. This infamous law was directed not only against preachers of heresy but also against the owners of heretical books, who were to be arrested and imprisoned. If they refused to recant, the bishops could hand them over to the civil authorities, by whom they were to be "burned on a high place before the people." The first victim was William Sautre, a parish priest at Lynn. With him began a long succession of the men and women who have been as beacon lights illuminating the rugged road which leads upward toward the emancipation of the minds and spirits of humanity. So long as the burnings continued it was impossible for the spirit of revolt to perish. Heresy might be driven into hiding but it could not be annihilated. The disciples of Wyclif, barefoot and clad in the picturesque reddish-brown habit, might disappear from the highways and the

open market places; but in secret places men read Wyclif's Bible, and little groups of men sat together in the night to ponder and discuss his words. Lollardry, as a visible organized movement, was destroyed; but the spirit of revolt against autocracy in Church and State was intensified. Martyrdom made certain the ultimate success of the work of the reformers.

It seemed as if the movement for the drastic suppression of Lollardry was complete; but with the suppression of freedom of thought, Oxford University passed into a time of sterility. The Church in England sank even lower in spiritual power. It had vast possessions of land and other property, and its first aim was to preserve this wealth; it ceased to be even a political leader and took shelter under the privileges of the land-owning aristocracy. Government became less humane through the weakening of popular influence; but Lollardry lived on as a spirit of moral and religious revolt which might, at times, maintain a sullen silence, but which used its influence day and night. Like a river which may disappear from the sunlight and flow for miles underground, only to reappear with the multi-

plied power of many secret tributaries, the spiritual life of a very large part of the population of England flowed by secret ways and gathered new power by the discovery of the unseen sources of personal religion. England was changed for all time, and its religion never returned to flow, as a united stream, in the channels of traditional faith.

The spiritual influence of Wyclif flowed from England into continental Europe, and, centuries afterwards, England received vital influences in a returning stream. A notable example of this is found in the influence of Huss, who was a direct disciple of Wyclif. Huss had a multitude of spiritual children, among them the Moravians. Peter Boehler, a Moravian, powerfully influenced John Wesley, in whose itinerant preachers the spirit of the Lollards was reincarnated and by whose work England experienced a revival of religion and a moral regeneration nearly four centuries after the vital work of Wyclif. England never wholly lost the tradition of a preaching ministry established by the Lollards. It was in 1381 that Wyclif denied the doctrine of transubstantiation and thus cut under the

whole monopoly of the Church. Within a century and a half the major part of the people of the Teutonic race had been lost to the Roman Church, and the reformation had done a work which could never be undone. In 1381 Wyclif stood utterly alone among the English people; in the later years millions were grouped around the utterance of his principles.

In the story of Wyclif and his followers, we have the story of the ending of mediævalism, and the dawn of our modern life. This new era is characterized by the emphasis on the powers of human personality, and by the expression of these powers in our modern institutions.

Chapter III

THE POWER OF PURITANISM

Long before the word Puritanism was used in England, this progressive movement was a great reality. Wyclif's work was retarded by two formidable obstacles. He wanted to educate the people of England, but lacked adequate implements. To make one manuscript copy of the Bible required about two years of the labor of an expert penman. How long would it take to make enough for all the people? Wyclif wanted also to develop the political power of the common people; but the feudal system assigned to the lords and the common people their respective places. What could overcome the colossal weight of this institution?

Less than a century after Wyclif had translated the Bible, the printing press was invented, which made it possible to print thou-

sands of copies of a book in less time than was formerly needed for the writing of one. Education had gained suddenly a very powerful implement. This invention was made about the year 1440.

In England the last half of that same century saw a very destructive civil conflict, the "Wars of the Roses." In this fratricidal strife so many of the members of the nobility were killed that the old feudal system was destroyed. The class of people who were engaged in commerce and agriculture stood quite apart from the conflict. It was essentially a war of men on horseback. The great lords and their feudal retainers were the fighters, and the strife ended from the exhaustion of the man power of the nobility of England. Great as was the vital loss from the fighting, the destruction of the feudal system opened a vast field of comparative freedom for the general population of the country, and the House of Commons gained greatly in strength and influence.

Thus the invention of the printing press and the destruction of the feudal system removed two of the most serious obstacles which had

stood in the way of Wyclif's educational and political work. The seeds he had sown yielded a new and large harvest. That same century saw the rise of the enlightening movement of the Renaissance. Greek culture was revived and was flooding western Europe. The fall of Constantinople in 1453, while not the cause of the Renaissance, gave a powerful stimulus to it. As it became evident that that ancient city would fall into the hands of the invading Turks, the civil population fled from the city. Many scholars, with priceless Greek manuscripts, fled westward; and they made a rich contribution to the educational and cultural resources of the Renaissance.

So far as the political, educational and religious life of England was concerned, two names are of the highest importance at this point in our story: Erasmus, a Dutch scholar, published the Greek New Testament in 1516; and a few years later Tyndale, a brilliant English scholar, translated it into vivid English and published his translation. Through the printing press, thousands of copies of this new and dynamic book went into the hands of English readers. To understand the growing

power of Puritanism, it is necessary to understand the power of this book.

Wyclif's Bible was translated from the Latin of the Vulgate, the official version used by the Catholic Church, so worded as to sustain her major doctrines. With the rediscovery of the Greek New Testament came the opportunity to do a new work which was direct and vital and stimulating. The stream flowing underground could come again into the sunlight. Through many years men had read Wyclif's work in secret. A graphic phrase speaks of men meeting to read "in a great book of heresy all the night certain chapters of the Evangelists in English." William Tyndale began his higher education as a student at Oxford, but went to Cambridge University and there came under the influence of Erasmus. He was thrilled by the Greek New Testament. Feeling the power of the great man's vision of translating and printing it in the language of the common people, Tyndale resolved to undertake this work for his own countrymen.

His plan, however, met with opposition, and nowhere in England did he find it possible to

undertake the work. In a sharp controversy with a churchman of high position he said hotly, "If God spare my life, ere many years I will cause a boy that driveth the plow to know more of the Scripture than thou dost." Not before he was a man of forty could he accomplish his purpose, and then in a foreign land. Crossing the English Channel he thought to carry on his work in seclusion and security. In 1525 he had translated the New Testament into English and was in the midst of the task of printing it. Pursued by his enemies, who were determined to prevent the book from reaching England, he fled with the printed sheets from Cologne to Worms. There six thousand bound copies of his New Testament were completed and later smuggled into England.

The bitterness of the Catholic opposition to this work was intensified by the fact that it bore traces of Luther's influence in the choice of some of its words, and with it came some of Luther's reprints of the tracts of Wyclif. Copies of Tyndale's book were seized and burned in the churchyard of St. Paul's; but the authorities of the Church in England did not know the number of books smuggled across

the Channel. London merchants and other citizens organized an association of " Christian Brethren " to circulate the books secretly. They spread over England in a way that is hardly surprising when we realize the experience which thousands of English people had already had in the clandestine circulation of the writings of Wyclif.

Before Tyndale could complete the great task of translating and printing the whole Bible, his work was interrupted. The agents of Cardinal Wolsey continued their unrelenting search for him and he was finally betrayed into their hands by a man who knew the secret place where he was doing his work. They seized Tyndale, strangled him and burned his body. Other men swept up his ashes, which immediately had become sacred; and still other men took up his unfinished work and carried it to a successful conclusion.

During these years of spiritual adventure, other events were making radical changes in the religious and political situation in England. The reign of Henry VIII was from 1509 to 1547. His first queen was Catherine of Aragon, and, in order to obtain a divorce

from her which was sanctioned by neither civil nor ecclesiastical law, he quarreled with the Pope and terminated at one stroke the authority of Rome within the borders of England. Yielding to his demand, the English Parliament declared him to be the head of the Church of England. He proceeded to suppress the monasteries and seize their lands and other possessions and to pillage the Church. By these drastic methods he ended the scandal of the holding of wealth so vast by the Church and the enormous revenues taken annually from England by the Pope. Henry VIII fortified himself in his autocratic position by enriching his favorites. In this process one fifth of the land of England was transferred from the Church to the men with whom the King surrounded himself. Under the act of *praemunire* (which was an act designed to check the influence of the Pope by making it a crime to introduce foreign authority into England) Cardinal Wolsey, head of the Church and chief adviser of the king, forfeited his estate; and his life soon ended.

It was the plan of Henry VIII to continue, with little or no change, the established forms

and ceremonies of the Church. His purpose was in no real sense the "Reformation" and he is not to be credited with bringing about, in England, that great change which created the Protestant churches in many lands. The real progress toward the reformation in England at this time came not because of the King's deeds but in spite of them. He wanted, in ecclesiastical matters, an authority as great as that of the Pope, and had no real sympathy with the spiritual aspirations of the common people. As his reign continued and moved toward its close, his influence was malign and his deeds evil. The kingdom was involved in a vast confusion.

It was in the midst of the reign of Henry VIII that Tyndale's New Testament began to circulate in England in spite of the most strenuous efforts of the ecclesiastical and political authorities to prevent it. Before many years it was evident that the people would have the Bible whatever the danger or difficulty, and the King promised them the Book in a new edition. He prohibited the circulation of Tyndale's Bible, or any parts of it, the reason for this prohibition being that it was executed in a

Protestant spirit. The King promised that his proposed edition would be a "more correct" version, meaning that it would sustain his views, which tended more toward Catholic doctrine; he was not primarily concerned for the accuracy of the translation from the original tongues. In 1530 he had appointed a commission to enquire into the expediency and the need of translating the whole Bible into English. The commission counseled delay because of the unsettled condition of religious opinions at the time, but recorded that the King "intended to provide that the Holy Scripture shall be, by great, learned and Catholic persons, translated into the English tongue, if it shall then seem to His Grace convenient to be."

In 1534 a convocation of the Church in England petitioned the King that the translation be made; and the petition was renewed in 1536. Miles Coverdale was placed at the head of the enterprise. He was an Augustinian friar, and had been at work for several years on the translation and printing of the Bible. So secretly was this work done that no positive records remain of the circumstances under which he worked. There is some evidence, but no con-

clusive proof, that he cooperated with Tyndale for a time in Hamburg; and it is probable that he began his work only a short time after Tyndale made a beginning on his pioneer enterprise. Coverdale's first translation was printed in 1535; and the new authorized edition, under the patronage of Henry VIII, was printed in 1539. It is called " The Great Bible " and it passed through seven editions in the next two years. An edition printed in 1540 bears, on the title page, the notation, " This is the Byble apoynted to the use of the churches." In the meantime Matthew's Bible, based on Tyndale's Bible and Coverdale's first edition, had been printed in 1537 and been issued with a license from Henry VIII. It had the approval of Archbishop Cranmer and of Thomas Cromwell, the king's chief adviser. Thus these three men of authority and influence sponsored it, without any formal ecclesiastical sanction. But Matthew's Bible was superseded by the Great Bible when the latter was issued.

It would seem that a complete victory had been won in the long contest for the use of the Bible, by the people of England, in their own

language. But, in the later years of the reign of Henry VIII, restrictive laws were passed regarding the reading of the Bible. Tyndale's version was prohibited in 1543, Coverdale's own edition in 1546, and only the Great Bible was authorized to be read. The Bible in any form was forbidden to artificers, apprentices, journeymen, servingmen under the degree of yeomen, husbandmen or laborers. No woman was to read the Bible at all unless she were a noble or gentlewoman. This legislation is important as showing the distrust of the intelligence of the common people. Of course these restrictions could not be enforced and the various editions of the Bible were read in secret by those to whom it was legally denied. Nothing could prevent the common people from reading the Bible, deriving spiritual inspiration from it, and interpreting it according to their own intelligence and religious experience.

The unsettled state of religious opinions in England is reflected in this uncertain progress of creating a Bible in the English language, but the tendencies of the times required that the English people exercise more of their own

intelligence in their devotional life and their public worship. In 1544, with the consent of Henry VIII, a litany was compiled in English and published by Archbishop Cranmer. Mass was still said in Latin, but the use of this litany was permitted.

In 1547 Henry VIII died and was succeeded by his son Edward VI, then a lad of nine years. The men entrusted with the task of governing the kingdom were sympathetic toward the movement away from Catholic practice, and the most notable result was that in 1549 the first Book of Common Prayer in the English language was published and legally authorized. In its use the Communion Service supplanted the Mass, and the Church of England officially adopted the language of the country. With minor revisions it continues to be used today in English-speaking countries.

The book is essentially the work of Cranmer. Whatever the appearance of weakness in his public career, he seemed inspired in his work of spiritual expression. He translated many parts of the Mass, thus embodying in the Book of Common Prayer many of the

great prayers of Christian history. A new and revised edition was issued in 1552, going further away from Catholic expression. But that edition represents the utmost concessions to Protestantism ever made in the book. All later revisions have tended toward Catholicism. It should be understood that at this time Puritanism in England was not a tendency toward a church separate from the Church of England, but was a movement within the Church to determine what its future character should be. Two lines of strain were powerful in the Church, one tending to obliterate the traditions of a thousand years of Catholicism, the other to perpetuate those traditions. For many men the resulting struggle was literally a matter of life-and-death, and no one in England could be indifferent to the outcome.

On July sixth, 1553, King Edward died, not having reached the age of sixteen years. He was succeeded on the throne by Mary, daughter of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon. It was in the fight for a divorce from Mary's mother that Henry VIII had cut off the Church of England from the Pope and

had made himself its head. Mary bitterly resented the treatment which her mother had received, revered her memory, and was fiercely Catholic in her personal faith and her governmental policies. While a funeral service, according to the new usage of the Church of England, was being held for Edward VI, Mary caused a Mass to be said for the repose of his soul.

Queen Mary abolished the Book of Common Prayer, restored the Mass in Latin, and did everything in her power to reunite the Church of England with Rome. She could not bring about the recognition of the Pope, nor could she restore the lands which her father had taken from the monasteries; but she carried on a vigorous and bitter persecution of the Protestants, thereby earning the title of "Bloody Mary." Nearly three hundred of her subjects were martyred in less than five years. Cranmer, the creator of the Book of Common Prayer, was burned at the stake.

In 1558 the death of Mary terminated her brief but dreadful reign and she was succeeded by Elizabeth, daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn. Her long reign of forty-five

years was marked by constructiveness even though there was a strong tendency toward conservatism in her policies. One of her first decisions, and this was of vast importance, was to restore the use of the second Book of Common Prayer of Edward VI. The book was officially put into use in 1559, with a few minor alterations which were in a Catholic rather than a Protestant direction.

The method of putting the Book of Common Prayer into use was the enactment of the Act of Uniformity, which named St. John's Day, June twenty-fourth, 1559, as the time when its use should begin everywhere in the kingdom, and no other form of public worship was thenceforth legal. The Act of Uniformity is important in its provisions; important also as an expression of the opinion of the time. Queen Elizabeth chose to follow a middle course in her reign, not taking the path on which King Edward had set out of making England more and more Protestant, nor following in the bloody steps of Queen Mary in restoring Catholicism. Having formed her policy and chosen her course she imposed her will very definitely upon the kingdom.

Though the opinion of the time was divided as to whether England should return to the Catholic position or move further in the uncharted way of Protestantism, it was the generally accepted opinion that *there should be uniformity in worship.* Men had not yet come to the idea of tolerating different faiths on an equality. Not only in England but in every other country in Christendom the dominant opinion was that there should not be two forms of religion in any one country. The policy of Elizabeth represented compromise: not that she was in the mood to compromise with those who differed from her, but that she demanded that the various parties in the Church, of which she was the Head, should compromise with one another and submit to the compulsory use of one ritual and the authority of one ecclesiastical government.

There was very stiff resistance to the Act of Uniformity, and a vigorous movement toward purifying the Church of England of every relic of Catholic tradition and doctrine; but Queen Elizabeth repressed these movements with unwavering will. Not many people were burned at the stake, but the dreadful

punishment was always a possibility. Outwardly the kingdom did attain a large measure of uniformity; but the English people had developed the capacity for stalwart individual thinking, for holding opinions even in silence, and for keeping in secret places their priceless volumes of devotional literature.

This stern law, passed in 1559, demanding conformity in worship, the rigid demand for the use of the Book of Common Prayer, and even the constant threat of the flames and the stake could not take from the hearts of thousands of devout and earnest English men and women the love of the Bible as a book of personal inspiration and spiritual guidance. For these people the Book of Common Prayer represented compulsion and repression, while the Bible represented the tradition of nonconformity and the hope of freedom. Sixty years later, John Winthrop was preparing for the great migration to New England. Thousands of English people were taking careful inventories of their possessions and deciding what should go with them into the new life, and what should be abandoned in England. Whatever else was chosen, the Bible must go

with them; and the Book of Common Prayer must be left behind. The acceptance of the one and the rejection of the other was not a matter of the mood at the time of the great migration but was the result of this long, long process of development of religious and political thought and life in England. The conflict of the books was momentous and of the highest degree of significance.

Chapter IV

ENGLAND AND NEW ENGLAND

Early in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, the term Puritanism was invented and applied to this movement which had been gathering political and religious power since the time when Wyclif had begun his work. Like the name Lollard, that of Puritan was applied in derision but was soon accepted by those to whom it was applied. These sturdy reformers wore it as a name of distinction. A name does much to intensify such a movement as Puritanism. It was in 1564, and by Matthew Parker, who had been appointed Archbishop of Canterbury by Queen Elizabeth, that the term was first used. In a decade it had come into general use.

The power of Puritanism is to be traced directly to the reading of the Bible. Men found in that book not only a means of private devo-

tion, which gave them a growing sense of not being dependent on the Church, but they found also an unfulfilled ideal of God's will concerning the Church. From reading and interpreting the Bible, men's minds began to build up a picture of an ideal Christian church and to compare that picture with the church which they knew in England. They saw differences and contrasts between the ideal church as they believed God intended it to be and the actual church, marred by the work of faithless men. They had the courage, also, to pass judgment on the existing church. Though this picture of a really Christian church existed only in their minds and nowhere in physical reality on the face of the earth, they judged this visionary church to be more true, more righteous and more authoritative than the visible church.

These men who cherished the vision of a perfect Christian church in England wanted it to be a church for all the people of the kingdom. They did not want two churches side by side, but believed that the actual church might be transformed into the ideal church. Puritanism, therefore, was not an expression

of a desire to form a sect nor to organize a church in conflict with the Church of England. It was an eadeavor to fulfil the vision of the ideal Christian church, as men derived that vision from the Bible; and to transform the visible church into the fulfilment of that dream. The movement was idealistic, spiritual, moral and educational. In endeavoring to do this idealistic thing, men knew that they could not point to any country in the world and say, There is the pattern which we must copy in order to have the perfect Christian church. It was, instead, a picture taken from a Book, a prophetic thing which had come down through many centuries. They wanted it to be less worldly and more spiritual than their own church; more righteous and truthful. And as they wanted it to be the church of all the people, they dared to hope for the achievement of the ideal of general intelligence, universal education, and such insight that the common people could turn to the Bible for inspiration and guidance.

The Puritans took the attitude of being loyal sons of the Church, not willing that she should have a rival nor be disowned or destroyed.

They wanted to correct her faults, cleanse her of unrighteousness, and establish her anew as the fulfilment of the Christian ideal of the Church.

This faith that the Bible contained a description of the Church, according to God's plan, was intensified by the systematic work of John Calvin in the interpretation of the Bible. He came to very definite convictions concerning it, and men of many nations were influenced by his ideas.

The policy of "Bloody Mary" had a most unexpected effect upon the development of the movement that was to receive later the name "Puritanism." Her frantic attempt to restore the power of the papacy in England and her bitter persecution of Protestants of all shades of opinion, drove many of these men from the kingdom for temporary residence where they might find toleration. Some went to Switzerland, notably to Geneva; others to Frankfort, Strasburg and other cities in Germany. A few years of close contact with Protestant people in these countries did much to clarify the thinking of these English exiles and to fortify their purposes. Men who sym-

pathized with the ideas of the Puritans and men who opposed them found themselves so far from England that they could *do* nothing about these matters, but they could *discuss* them without limit. Men who wanted the King Edward ritual just as it had been prescribed could have it in exile; and those who wanted to experiment with various revisions could make the experiments. In detachment from England, ideas could be carried to their logical conclusion, unhindered by practical considerations.

Of enormous importance was the result, in after years, of the thinking of the large group of exiles who went to Geneva. There John Calvin was doing his great life work. He had already published his *Institutes of the Christian Religion;* and he was virtually the city manager of Geneva, experimenting in the application of his logic to religious and civil government. Geneva was the real intellectual center of the Protestant Reformation, and Calvin had become the international leader of the movement. Among the English exiles were men who had graduated from Cambridge and Oxford Universities; and their four or

five years of residence in Geneva may be compared with a postgraduate course under the leadership of an intellectual giant. Bible study, including the original languages of Scripture, Biblical interpretation, Christian history, theology, theory of church government, theory of civil government and other subjects of major importance, made up the courses for study and discussion. Queen Mary, blind to the effects of her policy, was really forcing these men to become more capable of constructive work in carrying forward the Reformation.

As soon as the news of the death of Queen Mary reached these exiles, they hastened home. They were very hopeful that Queen Elizabeth would reverse the policy of Queen Mary; some hoped she would go even further than King Edward VI in the work of reforming the Church. Though the men of the different parties hoped that the views of their party would prevail, there were many who hoped for a comprehensive plan which would give a measure of *liberty* in faith and in the use of the ritual, a plan which would avoid unnecessary strife.

No one was long in doubt as to the policy of Queen Elizabeth. The Act of Supremacy placed her as the head of the Church; and she was fully determined to exercise all the authority of the position. The Catholic bishops who had served in the time of Mary refused, of course, to take the oath acknowledging Elizabeth as the rightful head of the Church, and their places were filled promptly with men of Elizabeth's own choosing.

The Act of Uniformity followed quickly. The Book of Common Prayer of 1552 was made obligatory, but it had some revisions. To the dismay of men who had returned from Geneva and whose thinking had progressed beyond even the most advanced which had prevailed in England in the last years of Edward VI, the revisions of the Prayer Book were backward instead of forward. It was the definite policy of Elizabeth to keep her church Protestant, so that she could be the ruling head of it, but to give as little offense as possible to the Catholics. The most significant thing in the revised Prayer Book, as prescribed by the Act of Uniformity, was that in the communion service the words which the minister used in

delivering the elements could be construed to be a recognition of transubstantiation.

It was further prescribed that " the minister at the time of the communion, and at all other times in his ministrations, shall use such ornaments in the church as were in use by authority of Parliament, in the *second* year of the reign of King Edward VI." The ministers were also to wear the garments used by Catholic priests in the celebration of the Mass. This reversed the reforming work accomplished during the later years of the reign of Edward VI. It meant that there was no hope of accomplishing immediately the reforms so valiantly advocated by the Puritans. Words, symbols and vestments were to remind people of the Mass and its central miracle, and to confirm the old ritualistic habits which were so strongly established in thousands of the people of England.

The Act of Uniformity was a surprise to the reformers, not only in going in the direction of Catholicism but in the rigidity of its demands for the regulation of the Church. It was necessary for the Queen to take a few years to reorganize the Church and fill its offices with

men acceptable to herself; but within a decade of her coronation this was done and she demanded of Archbishop Parker that he enforce rigidly the provisions of the Act of Uniformity. Until that time, many men hoped that there might be laxity in enforcement and a general leniency toward varying opinions in religious matters; but this policy of rigid enforcement, announced in 1556, dispelled these hopes.

This was a critical time, for it made inevitable the solidification of a party in the Church in opposition to the Queen and the Archbishop. The Puritans came very definitely to the consciousness of their program of reform. So many men had been martyrs for the ideas of the Puritans that these ideas were sacred. The years of new education at Geneva showed their results not only in men who had been exiles there but in the minds of many thousands of people who had listened eagerly and sympathetically to the preaching of these men since their return to their native land. Elizabeth and her bishops were tyrannical in their policy and rigid in enforcing it, and this sharpened the lines of the Puritan party and made their

wills more rigid. The more strict the demands of those in authority, the more unyielding was the resistance.

Looking at this situation even from our modern point of view, we should appreciate the spirit and courage of the Puritans. When Archbishop Parker demanded of the clergy the wearing of the prescribed vestments, many resigned their positions rather than yield. They must turn to other work to make a living, and this often meant great privation; yet they still kept their loyalty to the kingdom and the Church. They still maintained their determination to transform the Church according to their Puritan ideals. During the forty-five years of Elizabeth's reign there was no slightest concession to the Puritans in religious regulations or privileges; yet the party grew stronger through all those significant years, and its thinking made great progress.

Much was written and published in the course of the prolonged debate over the problems of the times. From the time that the term "Puritan" was applied in derision to these idealists, they gave added meaning to the term and wore it as a badge of distinction.

The very fact that they were not permitted to apply their principles to the reorganization of the Church meant that they were more purely idealists. Year after year they dreamed the dream of the transformed Church.

They argued valiantly for a more highly educated ministry. In the New Testament, in which they believed they traced the perfect pattern of the Church of Christ, they found much said about preaching. They wanted a preaching ministry rather than a reading ministry; they wanted men in the pulpits who were able to preach and to appeal to the intelligence of the people. They looked with some contempt upon a ministry which, for the most part, merely read a prescribed service out of a book.

The theory of a national established Church was that every baptized person in the kingdom was included in its fellowship and should share in its communion. The Puritans wanted so to emphasize the spiritual meaning of the ministrations of the Church that there would be a deepening of the spiritual life of the people. They wanted a strongly moral religion.

Through their study of the New Testament, and through the interpretations given by Calvin to what is said there concerning the government of the Church, they were convinced that there should be no bishops in the sense of a superior order of clergy: that ministers or presbyters were equal in rank with bishops. The Church, they believed, should be governed by the presbyters as a body and there should be no man who had autocratic power above them. Though the general attitude of the Puritans was that of loyalty to Queen Elizabeth, there were many who thought it an absurdity for a woman to be the head of the Church, inasmuch as Paul had said, "Let the women keep silence in the churches." Christ should be the real, though invisible, Head of the Church. It was because of these views that Archbishop Parker called the Puritans by the term "Presbyterians" as well as "Precisians." The three terms served his purpose according to his mood. "Presbyterian" meant governed by presbyters and had no reference to creed. On their part, they could expand their ideals with much clarity since they were not confronted with the practical

necessity of putting them into actual use in human affairs.

Queen Elizabeth had definite and serious reasons for her general religious policy. Catholic Europe and Protestant Europe were engaged in a life-and-death struggle. She must govern England with a very steady hand; but she must, if possible, avoid a conflict with any of the Catholic nations. She was afraid to adopt an aggressively Protestant policy in her own kingdom lest she incur the bitter enmity of Catholics abroad. There were plots against the life of Elizabeth. The nearest heir to the throne was Mary Queen of Scots, a devout Catholic, and many were the secret enemies of Elizabeth who wished to see Mary upon the throne of England.

It was the purpose of Queen Elizabeth to make the church a national body with its boundaries coextensive with the nation and its membership inclusive of the English people. The Catholic element in the nation wanted to restore the old connection with Rome and to reassert the absolute authority of the Pope. There were plots within the nation and without, to bring this about.

PURITAN PRINCIPLES

Puritanism, though it would have liked to reorganize the Church of England, was intensely in favor of making and keeping it a national church with a very inclusive membership. Puritanism was intensely religious and intensely patriotic. Not only did it favor the queen's policy of a national church, but it wanted to fortify that church against any possible encroachments of Rome and to defend it against all who plotted for the restoration of the authority of the Pope. The spirit of the Puritan made religion and political action practically identical, and the horizons of Puritanism were as wide as the boundaries of the nation. Whatever the Puritans might dream of changes in the ritual and government of the church, they believed absolutely in the principle of conformity: that every one in the nation should sustain it and obey it and share in its services. And the Puritan movement was mighty in its influence for the development of Parliamentary government, through which the life of the people of England should find fullest political expression. During the reign of Elizabeth, the Puritans were the dominant influence in the English House of Com-

mons and were developing rapidly their capacity for political insight and for self-reliant action in governmental matters. They had priceless experience in parliamentary procedure. The Queen might veto their measures, but they continued to initiate legislation and to debate it. The House of Commons was, for the Puritans, a valuable school in the science of government.

During the reign of Elizabeth came a change that was of vast importance: England became the dominant sea-power of the world. Not only were the people of England, during the time of Elizabeth, developing a national consciousness, but through a romantic succession of events they had their horizons greatly widened till they learned to look beyond the seas for the measure of their policies and the fulfilment of their greatest hope. The domination of the seas passed from the hands of Spain to those of England. To a casual observer it might seem as if this happened suddenly. There came, indeed, a time of crisis when it seemed as if Fate had capriciously snatched the sea-power from Spain and tossed it to the island kingdom of the north; but the proc-

esses leading up to that time of crisis were long and involved. To trace them even briefly is both interesting and illuminating.

Henry VII of England had a daughter, Margaret, who married the Scottish King, James IV. Their granddaughter was Mary Stuart, known in history as Mary Queen of Scots. After the death of "Bloody Mary" of England, there were many people of Catholic sympathies who looked upon Mary Queen of Scots, who was a Catholic, as the rightful heir to the English throne, and who saw the opportunity for uniting the kingdoms of Scotland and England. Elizabeth, coming to the throne of England at the age of twenty-five, ruled for forty-five years. All the early years of her reign were shadowed by the danger of the success of the plots to put Mary Queen of Scots on the English throne.

But the unhappy Scottish queen was herself deposed in 1567, and she blindly fled to England where she was imprisoned for twenty years. Plots on her behalf were formed both in England and on the Continent by those who would like to see a Catholic queen on the English throne. Popular exasperation at such

plots at last drove Elizabeth to sign the death warrant of the captive; and Mary Queen of Scots went to the block.

Meantime, Elizabeth had been excommunicated by the Pope. This was not in itself serious, for the Church of England had voluntarily cut itself off from communion with Rome. But the principal Catholic nation, Spain, undertook to crush England and punish Elizabeth by the expedition of "The Invincible Armada."

But why did Spain feel called upon to interfere in English affairs? Another romantic succession of events explains this. Recall that Columbus, who wanted to reach Asia by sailing not eastward but westward, went to Ferdinand and Isabella, king and queen of Spain, and made a plea for ships for the adventurous voyage. About the time of his first appearance at the Spanish court, a little princess was born to the royal pair; and she was called Catherine of Aragon. When Columbus first sailed to the western continent she was about seven years old. She afterwards married Henry VIII of England and became the mother of "Bloody Mary." This daughter,

Mary, queen of England just before Queen Elizabeth, married her kinsman Philip II of Spain. He became king not only of Spain but of the Netherlands, and did his utmost to destroy the Protestant Reformation and to restore the absolute power of the Roman Church.

In the Netherlands the Calvinistic party made a brave and determined stand for their faith. Motley, in his *Rise of the Dutch Republic,* says: "Upon the fifteenth of February, 1586, a sentence of the Holy Office condemned all the inhabitants of the Netherlands to death as heretics. . . . A proclamation of the King, Philip II, dated ten days later, confirmed this decree of the Inquisition, and ordered it to be carried into instant execution. . . . Three millions of people, men, women and children, were sentenced to the scaffold."

Of course such wholesale slaughter was not carried out, but it is estimated that in the Netherlands at least seventy-five thousand Protestants were martyrs in this terrible persecution.

Philip II regarded himself as the chosen implement for the restoration of the power of the Roman Church; and so, when Mary

Queen of Scots, a Catholic, was beheaded by permission of Queen Elizabeth, he regarded it as his duty and privilege to destroy the power of England. "The Invincible Armada" was a great fleet and represented the utmost of the sea-power of Spain. It sailed northward majestically as if wafted by the winds of fate. Philip prepared to celebrate gorgeously the victory of Spain and the humiliation of England. But the utter destruction of the Armada was not only a magnificent victory for England, but a terrific blow from which the proud kingdom of Spain could not recover. When this fleet was destroyed, Spain had no resources with which to build another. She lost for all time the dominion of the seas. She lost her hope of controlling the continent which Columbus had discovered with the ships furnished by Ferdinand and Isabella.

Back of the spectacular event of the destruction of the mighty fleet of Spain and the triumph of England's fleet, were conditions highly significant. Spain, in her support of Rome, had carried on her Inquisition which destroyed more than ten thousand of the most progressive and resourceful and intelligent peo-

ple of her own kingdom. She put an enormous premium on the docile mind which would give abject obedience to the clerical power. She put a frightful penalty on all originality of thought and action. Thus she destroyed her own power of recovery. The human element in the national resources was wickedly and wantonly wasted. She paid the penalty by losing her proud position of dominant nation of the world.

England had had her times of religious persecution, but the number of her martyrs was but a small fraction of the dreadful toll of the Spanish Inquisition. Meantime England was developing rapidly her human resources. The people were growing in initiative, in self-reliance, in general education, in enthusiasm and in a devoted loyalty to their nation. The sea fight between the Spanish Armada and the English fleet was but a trifling incident compared with these vital processes by which Spain was destroying herself while England was building herself anew. But the rejoicing over the victory was heightened by the sudden consciousness that England had no maritime foe to fear and that thenceforth her life was to

expand by pushing out across the seas and to the ends of the earth. From that time on, England became the principal colonizing nation of the world. This new impulse toward colonization was to have an unexpected influence on the religious situation in England before many decades had passed.

Having become the mistress of the seas, England could look confidently toward America as a continent for future colonization. This was of tremendous significance for the Puritans, for they were destined to create colonies in America and to test their principles on that new continent. Those principles were to develop into the ideals of the world's most powerful nation, the American Republic.

Though Elizabeth was able, during her long reign, to maintain the Church of England according to her own desires, and to prevent the coming of Mary Queen of Scots to the throne of England, the people of the land knew that a serious problem awaited the nation in the naming of her successor. She resisted the urgent requests of some of her statesmen that she marry, and when she died she was succeeded on the throne by the son of

Mary Queen of Scots. He had been crowned as James VI of Scotland in 1567 when his mother was deposed; and he was crowned king of England in 1603 as James I. Thus began the rule of the Stuart dynasty in England. The arrogance of James, his son and his two grandsons precipitated the civil strife out of which England emerged badly scarred but far along on the road toward modern democracy.

James I seemed quite incapable of understanding England and her people. An incident of his first journey from Scotland to the English capital is trifling in itself, but significant as illustrating things more important. At one place where the royal party stopped, a man was caught in the act of thieving. James ordered him hanged immediately and could not understand why his royal mandate was not obeyed. He was in the land of the Magna Carta which guaranteed even to the red-handed criminal a fair trial by his peers. James never adjusted his mind to this English sense of justice and of human values.

The Act of Supremacy, passed in 1559 by Elizabeth's first parliament, had made the

English sovereign the head of the English Church. James could not see that the Act of Supremacy was a Declaration of Independence, directed against Rome and asserted on behalf of the Church of England. It declared that the Pope was not supreme, but that, within England, the Church of England was supreme. James interpreted the policy of England, as expressed in such an Act, to be the personal supremacy of the sovereign in all matters of highest importance. He had long been galled by the Calvinistic doctrine, preached in Scotland, that the authority of the Church, governed by its elders and clergy, was higher than the authority of the State. The Scottish Parliament had no such vigor and vitality as the English Parliament, and the new king of England felt that he had attained a position where the royal will could be asserted. Being excessively arrogant, this suited his mood. Though the son of a Catholic mother, James was not a Catholic; but he was quite willing, in England, to assume a power as great as that of a pope.

Though the Puritans had supported Elizabeth loyally and were devoted to the idea of a

church of England to which all should conform, they looked forward to some turn of events which might enable them to reform that Church and achieve the ideals which were their hearts' desire. Immediately on the coming of James to the throne, they prepared a petition, hoping that, in conference with the new sovereign, they might find their long deferred opportunity. James did receive the Puritans at Hampton Court but scarcely listened with patience to their proposals. His reply was a most extreme expression of religious and political autocracy, and he reached his climax in the famous declaration, "I will make them conform or I will harry them out of the land."

Out of his interpretation of the Act of Supremacy he developed the doctrine of "The Divine Right of Kings." This he applied not only to ecclesiastical matters but to civil. He showed promptly his determination to become an absolute monarch. Parliament, which for centuries had been gaining influence, self-reliance and the ideals of constitutional government, saw that the situation had become suddenly ominous. The great majority of the members of Parliament were Puritans. They

were concerned for the religious outlook as well as the political. When Parliament assembled in 1604, it endeavored to put its desire for reforms into definite laws. The King's utter refusal to entertain their propositions led to a declaration, on the part of Parliament, of its rights as against the pretensions of the King. His response was to dissolve Parliament in anger.

Thus began a struggle for the rights of Parliament, which was to continue in varying forms for nearly half a century and then to plunge England into civil war. In keeping with his assertion of absolute authority, the King increased the autocratic power of the bishops of the Church of England. Thus two sharply defined parties were developed. Those who were Puritan in religion, and all who sustained the rights of Parliament as representing the people of the kingdom, were solidified into one party. Those who wanted unlimited ecclesiastical power in the hands of the bishops and believed in an absolute monarch on the throne, became a closely knit party in sharp contrast. The Puritans had promoted every progressive movement in the kingdom and now they be-

came the champions of orderly government against the will of a tyrant.

The form which the contest between king and parliament took was largely that of a contest over the control of the revenues of the government, including the right of taxation. James tried by every means to raise money for his lavish expenditures without having to ask Parliament for it. On the other hand, Parliament used every opportunity for the assertion of its constitutional right to the control of taxation. When, at the end of the first decade of his reign, it became imperative for James to call for the election and assembly of a parliament, he endeavored to secure the election of candidates favorable to his purposes; but the country was thoroughly aroused and the royal candidates were rejected and popular candidates elected. Not only was the clear-cut issue thus faced, but democratic leaders appeared who became popular heroes.

James summoned Parliament as infrequently as possible; and always it asserted its right. Men were thinking with the utmost clearness about the great problems of constitutional government and the proper re-

strictions upon the power of the sovereign. In the white heat of the prolonged contest, principles were shaped which were to be the mighty implements of popular government in years to come.

In 1625 James I died, and his son, Charles I came to the throne. There were those who hoped for brighter days in the reign of the new king. Such hopes were quickly blasted and the fact that Charles's queen was a French Catholic caused the gravest apprehension for English Protestantism.

Charles I saw that Puritanism dominated the English House of Commons; therefore he resolved to get rid of that power, which sought to restrict him. He demanded of Parliament a vote of large sums of money to be raised by taxation in order that the royal plans might be carried out. Parliament was willing to grant the King modest sums of money on condition of political and religious reforms. The lines came to be very sharply drawn. The House of Commons stood for the rights of the people of England, and was determined to control taxation. The King pushed, even further than had his royal father,

the doctrine of the divine right of kings, and regarded as treason and blasphemy all endeavors to resist the royal will. Therefore Charles I resolved to rule England without a parliament, and to raise vast sums of money by extortion.

Discoveries and explorations had given to the people of England a knowledge of the new continent to the westward. During these trying times many of the Puritan people were saying that if in England they could not carry out their progressive plans in religion and politics they might create a new England in the North American wilderness. It seems paradoxical that Charles I was pleased with this plan, but he saw in it two possibilities which seemed to favor his policies. He saw first that a migration of Puritans across the Atlantic would divide his opponents. He believed, too, that if a large company of English people were developing the virgin resources of the American seacoasts, forests, streams, fields, and possibly the mines, he might, by new taxation, fill his depleted treasury from these new sources.

It is one of the strangest paradoxes of all

history that during one week in March 1629, Charles I dissolved the English Parliament, not to reassemble it for a decade, and also signed the charter of the colony of Massachusetts Bay.

It was a common thing in those days for the head of a business organization to be called Governor, and at that time there were many projects for transporting large numbers of people from England to distant parts of the world in order to develop new resources. Charles I believed that he was signing the charter of a commercial company. The Puritans, however, were determined that the organization of that company should be the beginning of a movement for a new political government. In the course of a few months John Winthrop was named "Governor of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay." Charles I regarded that title as equivalent to that of business manager of a colonizing corporation. The Puritans knew that his title of Governor was to carry with it the significance of head of the new government.

The Puritans were shrewd enough in their negotiations with the king to avoid saying any-

thing in the charter about where the seat of government should be. In their hearts they were determined that the seat of government should not be kept in England nor under royal control. When the charter had been signed it was guarded as a priceless possession, and in April 1630 John Winthrop, with a little fleet of ships, set sail for the North American coast, carrying with him that charter which was destined to be the foundation for a new government of mighty influence. He arrived in the harbor of Salem in June 1630, and after a brief survey of that part of the coast, he sailed into the mouth of the Charles River and made his final landing. With their feet upon American soil the people that were with him held a popular election and John Winthrop was thus elected Governor of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay.

During the next ten years, twenty thousand people followed in this migration and established many communities and developed their colonial government. What they did in that decade is one of the greatest achievements of human history.

Chapter V

CREATIVE PRINCIPLES OF THE PURITANS

From the beginning of their first settlements in New England, the Puritans showed a remarkable capacity for organizing their governments. With their feet planted on American soil, they began immediately to vote upon vital matters and to hold elections for the choice of their governing officers. In their first years of organized life in New England, they put into practice democratic principles which not only continued to be operative in their colonies but were embodied later in the form of organization of the American Republic and have influenced the political life of the civilized world down to the present time.

To account for this aptitude for self-government on the part of the early Puritan settlers, it is necessary to look not to untried theories, spun out of their dreams during the

long weeks of their transatlantic voyages, but to their experience in England as the champions of constitutional government, when it was menaced by kings who sought to be absolute monarchs. The movement promoted by the Puritans in England during the greater part of the preceding century, was one of the most significant movements for popular government in the history of the world. The migration to New England was planned and managed by men who knew clearly the principles which they desired to test on new soil in the western world.

To people of the time, who did not understand Puritanism, it seemed as if a strange and sudden impulse was impelling twenty thousand people to migrate from England to New England in the decade from 1630 to 1640. It was not a sudden impulse which caused the migration, nor did the people go unprepared. The power of that impulse had been accumulating for decades. The migration began abruptly, but it was the sudden releasing of this accumulated power.

There have been times in history when large bodies of people have ceased abruptly to live

their normal life, abandoned their major possessions, and fled in terror before a new and unexpected danger. But it was not so in the Puritan migration. Amazing capacity for concerted action and for orderly movement was displayed by the people. Large organizing ability was evident in the plans of the managers and the carrying out of those plans. To arrange for two hundred ships, to plan the transportation of twenty thousand people and their necessary equipment, to navigate these ships successfully across three thousand miles of ocean, to house these people in new communities and to appoint them their places in the new life — this was an administrative task of the first order of importance. Without great courage, men would not have undertaken this movement, and without large organizing ability it would have failed miserably. It was a migration without a parallel in human history.

Because they were acting on definite principles, on which they and their fathers had acted for years, the first of these people who arrived set about the task of establishing their new life with great definiteness. The plans of

their communities expanded year by year as thousands of their fellows arrived. While clearing the ground and rearing their buildings, they shaped their institutions.

There was much discussion of plans and there were sharp differences over methods; but the major principles of the Puritans were definite, and they moved toward the application of those principles even though by different paths. They had faith in the powers of the plain people and proposed to make opportunity for the full development and expression of those powers. The *details* were yet to be worked out, but the major *principle* was already a great conviction with them. They were certain that they would have no autocracy in Church or State. Just how these institutions should be governed must be a matter for experiment, but the ideal of a larger freedom was clearly formed in their minds. The welfare of the whole population should be promoted, and there should be no privileged class who should become wealthy by impoverishing others. The *means* by which general prosperity was to be assured must be determined by future experience, but the con-

cern for human well-being was dominant with them. Government should be based on a constitution. Though they brought no clearly defined constitution with them and could not predict the details of their future government, they knew well that the major function of government was to promote the welfare of the whole population.

In England they had lived under the shadow of the monarchy, and their parliamentary action had been thwarted again and again. They had belonged to a church which had in it an element of mediæval despotism, and they had never had a full measure of freedom for the expression of their own convictions in ecclesiastical organization. Nominally the king and the archbishops still had authority over them in their new home; but practically they emerged into a life which gave them opportunity to build anew according to the desires of their hearts. In short, they had been like a minority party in England; and now suddenly they became the dominant force in a new life. They set about the making of their vital experiment with large ability and much patience. Their faces were toward the future,

and they were thrilled by great expectations. Above all else, they were determined to know what God's will was concerning them, and to fulfil that will at any cost. That determination carried them through difficulties and hardships in the presence of which other men had given up in despair.

In the Puritans was embodied anew that indomitable will so finely exemplified in the Pilgrims at Plymouth. Elder William Brewster said of the Pilgrims, " It is not with us as with men whom small things can discourage or small discontentments cause to wish themselves at home again."

They could not be copyists; they had to be creators. They could not organize their life according to patterns existing anywhere. The institutions of the life of England were, for these pioneers, altogether inadequate. The English monarchy was, to them, repellent; for it embodied tyranny. Queen Elizabeth, and Kings James and Charles had held back the progress of the Puritan movement. But how should these pioneers organize their government, and what should take the place of the monarchy?

They believed very strongly in the English Parliament — for England. In recent years, the Puritans had been the staunch and indomitable defenders of the rights of Parliament and especially of the rights of the common people of England as expressed in the House of Commons. But could they copy the English Parliament in their New England colony? Evidently they could keep the *principle* of such a legislative body, but must create a new form of organization. The English plan of a landed aristocracy, with hereditary rights in the House of Lords, was incompatible with Puritan principles. Some method must be devised for utilizing the ability of the most capable men in the community, but they would not organize an aristocracy.

The Church of England could not be a model for the church of the Puritans in New England. They and their forefathers had contended for decades that the pattern of the church of Christ, as discovered in the New Testament, did not establish a higher order of clergy to rule the presbyters or pastors of the local churches. English bishops were, to them, abhorrent; for they exercised tyrannical power.

The Puritan clergy had suffered much at their hands. The Puritans believed in having a national church of England; and they believed in this as ardently as any man of the anti-Puritan party. But the Puritans believed in having one order of clergy, and a government of the church in which the clergy had no one above them to exercise arbitrary power. It is evident that the Church of England was not a suitable model for the organization of churches in the new colony.

English laws and legal methods were seriously in need of reform. There was much cruelty, much injustice, in them. The Puritans are often misrepresented as the originators of cruel laws and of debasing forms of punishment; but the truth is that they were determined to be much more humane and to seek a great reform in laws, legal procedure and penalties. Just as they were the broad-church party in religion and the progressive party in politics, so also were they the humanitarians of their time. The Puritans who came to New England brought only a minimum of English law and had to organize a new code on a more humane basis. To no country could

they turn for model legislation. They must create anew their code.

Thus in addition to the executive task of planning and completing their great migration, the Puritan leaders who came to New England had to begin life anew and lay the foundations for all the institutions of their life. Upon these foundations they must rear the structures of a new type of civilization, seeking to translate idealistic principles into actual institutions. They needed time and opportunity for a great experiment. They had to overcome serious difficulties and to contend with people who sought to thwart their experiment. The consequences were other than what they expected and the results larger than they dreamed. Their essential principles, which they embodied in a little colony, were justified and became the foundation of a great nation.

Before the Puritans shaped their plans for the colony of Massachusetts Bay, there had been other plans for colonies of English people. None of these was a model for the Puritan plan. Here we need to make clear the distinction between a proprietary colony and a corporate colony. Back of this distinction is

the difference between exploiting the resources of a distant land for the profit of English capitalists and developing such an area as the permanent home of a colony of English people. For many years, Englishmen had been developing the fishing industry on the Grand Banks near Newfoundland. It is estimated that ten thousand men might have been active in this enterprise in a season. They sailed from England in the spring, and had temporary shelters on the shores of Newfoundland. The ships sailed back and forth during the summer, carrying salt fish to Europe and bringing supplies to the fishermen. But these men were transported back to England before winter set in.

This fishing enterprise was extended to other parts of the American coast, and, in later years, some men were left through the winter to live in their crude shelters and to engage in the fur trade with the Indians. When in 1607 a settlement was established on Chesapeake Bay, it was intended by the promoters to be a permanent colony, and it did develop into the colony of Virginia. But at first no women came and there was no family life. The

first purpose was to develop the resources of the sea, the fields, the forests and (they hoped) the mines. The settlers were to work, and the profits were to go to the men in England who had invested in the enterprise and were the proprietors.

At Plymouth in New England was a small colony of people who had come as families, and intended to make it their permanent home and fulfil their ideals. But on the financial side, Plymouth was established as a proprietary colony. The colonists were unable to finance the voyage of even their one little ship, the *Mayflower,* bearing a hundred souls. A company was organized in England to finance the enterprise, and the settlers were really bondservants of the proprietors until, by much industry and close frugality, they had paid principal and interest on the necessary investment. There were instances of single individuals receiving from the king of England a grant of land large enough for a colony, and this individual was the proprietor.

A corporate colony was a different kind of enterprise. The people who migrated shared in the ownership of it. This meant that men

having ability and financial resources joined in the migration, and shared in the risks and the hopes of the new life. They went into the venture not merely as capitalists nor as bond-servants but as partners in a new life. Such a colony was that of the Puritans who founded Massachusetts. The difference between a proprietary colony and a corporate colony is made more clear if we consider the relationship of the colonist to the colony. Did he work for a proprietor or for himself? The proprietor might be a man or a group of men; but the settler in an American colony, who knew that any profits of his labor went to a proprietor in England, worked in a spirit very different from that of a settler in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay who owned outright his own land and his own home, and who knew that he and his neighbors profited by the industry of all the colonists.

In Virginia, three years after its settlement, there were only sixty living settlers out of three hundred who had been sent out. In nine years sixteen hundred were sent out, and at the end of that time the population was only about three hundred and fifty. After seventeen

years there were twelve hundred inhabitants; and it took forty-five years for the colony to gain a population of twenty thousand people. To Massachusetts came twenty thousand people in the first great tide of migration from 1630 to 1640.

Green, in his *History of the English People,* says of the Puritans who settled Massachusetts: "Nor were the emigrants, like the earlier colonists of the South, 'broken men,' adventurers, bankrupts, criminals; or simply poor men and artisans, like the Pilgrim Fathers of the *Mayflower.* They were in great part men of the professional and middle classes; some of them men of large landed estates, some zealous clergymen like Cotton, Hooker or Roger Williams, some shrewd London lawyers, or young scholars from Oxford. The bulk were God-fearing farmers from Lincolnshire and the eastern counties. They desired in fact, 'only the best' as sharers in their enterprise; men driven forth from their fatherland, not by earthly want, or by the greed of gold, or by the lust of adventure, but by the fear of God, and the zeal of godly worship."

These Puritans came not as fugitives from oppression and not in a mood of negation; they came as creators of a new era, and in the mood of affirmation. Their coming was not a last resort of those driven to despair but the initial act of a new epoch in human history. At a time when the defenders of human rights seemed to be facing defeat in every country in Europe, these Puritans chose a new home in the American wilderness, where the great contest might be renewed and their faith in the powers of human personality might be justified.

The promoters of the great migration combined a vigorous idealism with good judgment in practical matters. They must secure the right to occupy land, and also obtain a charter for the organization of a colonizing company. In 1606 James I had granted charters to a company with its head office in London, England, and another with its head office in Plymouth, England. The former developed the settlement at Jamestown, Virginia; the latter made a futile attempt at a settlement on the coast of Maine. But another company called "The Council for New England" was chartered in

1620 with Sir Ferdinando Gorges as its chief promoter. The Pilgrims had obtained a grant of land from the Virginia Company. The *Mayflower,* aiming at "northern Virginia," was driven from its course by storms and found shelter within Cape Cod. Finding themselves outside of the territory of the Virginia Company, the Pilgrims obtained, in 1621, a grant of land from the Council for New England. To that Council, in 1628, went the men who were organizing the Puritan migration and obtained a grant of land extending from three miles south of the Charles River to three miles north of the Merrimac River, and extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans. No one then dreamed of the width of the North American continent. The royal charter, granted in March 1629, gave the promoters of the plan the legal right to establish their colony. Nothing was said about the seat of authority; but the king assumed that it would be in England and that Massachusetts would be a *proprietary* colony. But in August 1629 a group of twelve men, leaders in the plan for the colony, signed the "Cambridge Agreement," which was a decision to transfer the

charter and the seat of government to New England. The leaders agreed to join in the migration, and John Winthrop, who was chosen to lead the migration, received the title of Governor. Thus the colony became a corporate, not a proprietary, colony. The colonists went out as families to make homes in New England for themselves and their descendants. Their intense loyalty to Puritan principles and the high average of ability in their picked company brought success to the great adventure, when a merely commercial incentive would have meant failure. Their charter had to be interpreted liberally to give them the right to do all that they planned in the direction of a republican form of government. The charter did give them the ownership of the land on which they began to build; and, with three thousand miles of ocean between themselves and the king of England, they dared to assume a large measure of independence. Within five years the demand was made on them that they surrender their precious charter. Their answer was to keep the charter and to fortify Boston Harbor. The first seeds were sown which, in a century-and-a-half,

would develop into American independence and the creation of a new republic.

A later chapter of this book tells the story of experiments in government in the group of colonies founded in New England. Here let us see the major plans of the Puritans for the expression of their principles. Probably no great and progressive movement in human history has ever been so misrepresented as Puritanism. It was not cruel but humane; not repressive but educational; not conservative but forward-looking. The Massachusetts Colony was probably the most highly educated community that the world had ever known. It has been estimated that one man in every two hundred people was a university graduate; and many others, though lacking university degrees, represented the finest culture of the age. The iconoclastic acts done in the confusion of the civil war in England, at the time of Oliver Cromwell, have led to the assertion that Puritanism was destructive of the finer things of life. The critics who made such statements should remember that Spenser's *Faerie Queene,* John Milton's *Paradise Lost* and John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress,*

works of immortal beauty, are among the many enduring products of *Puritanism*. The humanism which was at the very heart of Puritanism, the faith that human nature is infinitely precious because man is the child of God, has produced the noblest works of modern life in English-speaking countries.

The Puritans who came to Massachusetts with Winthrop in 1630, and in the years immediately following, proceeded with remarkable directness to the creative tasks of their new life. A survey of the coast and a consultation as to the surest way to avoid the danger of the destruction of the Colony by its enemies led to the decision to plant their communities "in dispersion." They would make sure that all would not be destroyed at one blow. The capital, Boston, was on a peninsula, not altogether easy of access. The scattered communities had to assume a large measure of local self-government. But the charter contained stipulations regarding the central government of the whole colony, stipulations which had been made when it was assumed that the colony was to be managed by a limited group of proprietors. Now the charter was being ex-

panded to serve as the foundation for what was practically a republic.

From their long defense of the rights of the English Parliament, and especially of the House of Commons as representing the common people, the Puritans had developed a valiant faith in the principle of self-government. In every new community of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, the people developed the town meeting. It was a wonderful school for education in direct political action; an expression, in a new form, of the old cherished principle of self-government. It developed a spirit of sturdy self-reliance. Pure democracy has probably never had a more perfect means of education and of action than the New England town meeting. Men meet face to face, discuss their common welfare, make their motions, debate them, vote upon them, and act in accordance with those votes. As a general principle the Puritans believed in the capacity of man for self-government, and the town meeting justified that faith. They learned, also, to establish a proper balance between the local authority of the town meeting and the central authority of the colonial gov-

ernment. They learned to adjust legislation and taxation in such ways as to promote the welfare of the entire population. Having no reigning sovereign and no aristocracy, they developed their political government through their faith in the ability of the plain people to rule for the welfare of all. This was their political expression of their faith in human ability.

The Puritans were deeply concerned over the problem of the proper organization of the Christian church in their new colony. In England the established church was coextensive with the nation. According to the theory of the Church, every person born in England should be baptized within a few days of his birth, and thus take the first step into fellowship with the Church. Not only all the *land* of England but all the *people* of England should, accordingly, be related to the Church. The whole country was divided up geographically into parishes, the boundaries of which were clearly defined. Every man's land was part of a parish, and he was taxed for its support. Each parish had its church building and one or more clergymen.

The Puritans believed in the national Church and the parish organization, but they wanted to reform the ritual and the episcopacy. During the reign of Elizabeth they had worked and waited, but realized that it might be years or decades before they could accomplish a nation-wide reformation. Meantime there were men in England who said "Let us have reform without tarrying for any." They looked at the problem from the opposite end, not desiring to begin with a change of the national church but in the local community. They believed, from studying the New Testament, that a Christian church was a company of "believers" who came together, in their community, for fellowship, instruction and worship. Such a church should elect, from its own membership, one to be pastor. While consecrated to the work of the ministry, he was the minister of this one church, and did not become a member of a general body of clergy with general authority. The local church had no geographical territory to supervise, and it did not include the general population in its membership. "Come ye out from among them and be ye separate" was a great

text for them. They felt that they should separate themselves from the unbelievers and the immoral of their own community except that they had a duty to win them to the Christian faith and life. They were certain that they should separate from the national Church with its autocracy and its mediævalism.

These radical reformers won the title "Separatists" and endeavored to organize congregations in several communities in England. They were opposed by the "High Church" party and the Puritan party and suffered great persecution. From Scrooby in England a congregation migrated to Holland to escape persecution. With them went their pastor, John Robinson, and their elder, William Brewster, two men of great ability. In Leyden this congregation grew; but its leaders realized, after a few years, that they were facing the loss of the sense of English nationality. A number of them returned to England, and, from Plymouth, migrated in the *Mayflower*. Their pastor, John Robinson, was not in sufficiently vigorous health to make the voyage. The little company of one hundred

people was led by their elder, William Brewster, and another layman of great ability, William Bradford, who served them for many years as the wise and patient governor of their colony, Plymouth. He has immortalized their courage in a careful history, the original manuscript of which is in the State House in Boston.

The distinction between Puritans and Separatists should be kept clear. The Pilgrims who settled Plymouth were Separatists and carried their church with them from Scrooby to Leyden, back to England, and across the Atlantic Ocean to Plymouth, where it continues to this day. Its organization in England is the distinctive type of a Congregational church.

The Church of England was episcopal; that is, it was governed by bishops. The Puritans would have liked to change to a government by the clergy or presbyters; thus it would have been Presbyterian. The Separatists would have liked to gather, in every community, a church of believers which would have local self-government; this would have been a Congregational system, in which

each local church would ordain its own ministers.

Before John Winthrop came to Boston in 1630, Salem was a little settlement. There the first of the pioneers of the great migration found a safe harbor and a place to rear their simple habitations. In 1628 John Endecott was temporarily appointed their governor.

In 1629 they organized the first Puritan church on American soil. During the previous winter there had been much sickness among the pioneers, and a physician from Plymouth did them a great service, spending much of the winter there. He and the Puritans discussed at length the problem of the true pattern of the church of Christ.

In 1629 Endecott received a copy of the new charter of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, and additional settlers. Among them were two ordained clergymen of the Church of England who were Puritans, Samuel Skelton and Francis Higginson. It is highly significant that when, in the summer of 1629, the church at Salem was organized, it was upon the Congregational model. A covenant was adopted

very similar to that of the Plymouth church. The members acted on their own authority. They elected Samuel Skelton and Francis Higginson as their ministers, and, disregarding their episcopal ordination, laymen of the church ordained them by the laying on of hands.

Two Englishmen of Salem, who were not Puritans, and who attempted to hold a service with the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, were promptly deported by the energetic governor, John Endecott. Thus the first settlement of Puritans on American soil became Separatists. Fraternal delegates from the Plymouth church came to Salem to share in the solemn service of organization and ordination and to express the fellowship of the churches in Plymouth and Salem. To have fellowship with Separatists had been one of the last things desired by the Puritan leaders in England; but Salem was separated from England by three thousand miles of stormy ocean, while Plymouth could be reached by a pleasant sail on a summer day.

John Robinson had said to the Pilgrims before they left Holland:

"I charge you before God to follow me no further than I have followed Christ; and if God should reveal anything to you by any other instrument of his, to be as ready to receive it as ever you were to receive any truth by my ministry; for I am very confident that the Lord hath more truth and light yet to break forth out of his Holy Word. The reformed churches are come to a period in religion and will go no further than the instruments of their reformation. The Lutherans cannot be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw. Whatever part of God's will has been imparted and revealed to Calvin, the Lutherans will die rather than embrace it. And the Calvinists, as you see, stick where Calvin left them. Though Luther and Calvin were precious shining lights in their times, yet God did not reveal his whole will to them. I beseech you to remember your church covenant, wherein you promise and covenant, with God and with one another, to receive whatsoever light or truth shall be made known to you from the written Word of God."

In 1629, after the great help rendered to the settlers in Salem by a physician from Plymouth, John Endecott, the Puritan governor in Salem, wrote to William Bradford, the Pilgrim governor in Plymouth:

> " God's people are all marked with one and the same mark, and sealed with one and the same seal; and they have, for the main, one and the same heart, guided by one and the same spirit of truth; and, where this is, there can be no discord; nay, here must needs be sweet harmony. And the same request, with you, I make unto the Lord, that we may, as Christian brethren, be united by a heavenly and unfeigned love, bending all our hearts and forces in furthering a work beyond our strength, with reverence and fear, fastening our eyes always on Him, who only is able to direct and prosper all our ways."

Thus did a spirit of the finest humanism, inherent in Separatism and also in Puritanism, bring together in sympathy the representatives of two movements hitherto antagonistic. The

action of the church in Salem did much to fix the congregational form of church government upon the Puritanism of New England. Further events confirmed this tendency.

During the great migration and afterwards, when a group of people wanted to establish a new town, the land was assigned to them by the central government of the colony. In each town a church or parish was organized. We have seen that the decision was made during the summer of 1630 to plant their first towns " in dispersion," as a mother partridge teaches her brood to scatter when the hawk hovers over them; and this resulted in an emphasis on the town meeting as the form of government which touched them vitally in their daily life. In the same way, the church in the town became a very vital expression of their religion and the most effective means of cultivating it. The same men who met in town meeting to deal with political affairs met in church to deal with religious interests. The faith which they had in themselves had political and religious expression: if they were capable of self-government in secular matters, they were capable of self-government in spiritual matters. When

the men of the town had a meeting and voted for selectmen to form an executive committee for the material affairs of the town, they could easily proceed to call themselves into a session of their parish to see that business connected with religion was properly transacted. Taxes were levied for streets and also for the support of the church, being voted by the same men.

Just as the New England town meeting was the most vital school of political experience which the settlers could devise, so the town church, or parish church, was the kind of religious institution most perfectly adapted to their needs. In no other way could religion be made more dynamic in their lives or more real to their consciousness. It is a mistake to imagine that Puritanism was characterized by an endeavor to perpetuate a fixed creed or to enforce a rigid form of ritual or church government. Indeed, the Puritans distrusted ritual, because they associated it with the demand for conformity; and they detested autocracy in church government for they had suffered much from the arrogance of bishops. In creed they were for the most part Calvinists, but with a large degree of flexibility. The typical or-

ganization of a church was on the basis of a simple covenant instead of a creed. In every town the people were at liberty to write a creed of their own if they wished. They were engaged in the endeavor to know the Bible and to understand it. They knew that many minds would spend many years in studying, searching and debating the doctrine of holy Scripture without exhausting the priceless treasure of truth within it. At home and at church they obeyed the word, "Search the scriptures." Their views were sufficiently free and flexible for them to prize greatly the principle that every man should interpret the Bible for himself.

It was consistent with their supreme emphasis upon the Bible that they rejected utterly the idea of having bishops who should rule over their churches. In the early years of the colony they were uncertain as to the final plan of church government which they would adopt; but they were quite certain about the rejection of the episcopacy, and passed a law forbidding any man even to advocate having bishops.

Just as the emphasis on the town meeting was adjusted to a recognition of the necessity

for a central government, so their congregational plan for the local church admitted of interchurch fellowship. They might have adopted the presbyterian form of church government and still have been consistent with their Calvinism and with the prevalent views of many English Puritans of the time of Cromwell. Had they done so, they would have created a body of clergy closely organized. These men would have been members of a governing body for the churches. In each local church they might have chosen a "ruling elder," a layman, who should share the duties of government with the minister of the church. All the "ruling elders" might also have been members of the same governing body to which all the clergy belonged. This would have given laymen a representation and such a system would have been presbyterian.

Some such plan might have been predicted from the presbyterian views cherished by Puritans in England from the end of the reign of "Bloody Mary" till the time of Cromwell's Commonwealth, a century later. But the New England Puritans moved rapidly toward a greater degree of democracy. They empha-

sized freedom of thought and action in the local church, and this was consistent with the spirit of the town meeting. They disliked very much the idea that a priest had superhuman power, for that was central in the doctrine of the Roman Church. Hence they turned rapidly from the idea of establishing a clerical class which might rise to undesirable power. They did respect highly their ministers, but they kept the final religious authority in the hands of the membership of the churches; and each minister was a member of the church in the town of which he was a citizen.

It was consistent with this democracy in town government and in church life to believe that every man had the capacity for a first-hand knowledge of God. They were endeavoring to develop a "Bible Commonwealth," and their conception of its citizenship was that of men with divine powers. Thus their humanism took the form of a very noble faith. They wanted their government in safe hands. They would have no aristocracy, but instead they would trust public affairs to the men of character. The test of character was the wisest they knew: it was expressed in the law that the

suffrage should be bestowed only on men who were members of the churches. Thus the town meeting and the town church were made practically identical.

Puritanism in England had emphasized for generations the idea of a preaching ministry. The Puritans kept the tradition that came down from John Wyclif. They wanted men who were capable of going into their pulpits and stating religion intelligently, men who respected the intelligence of the people in the audience. They despised the "reading ministry," men who were able merely to read the ritual from a book. They knew that in the New Testament a great deal was said about preaching, and they were sure that the well-equipped minister of Christ must be a preacher of intelligence.

One of the first plans of the Puritans of the great migration to New England was to found a college. They wanted to prepare their own sons to go into their pulpits; they could not depend on having them trained in England. In the summer of 1630, as Winthrop was planning for government and other imperative needs of his people, the plans were started for

a college. In 1636, in the midst of the migration, the college was founded, though it meant a heavy drain upon the resources of the young colony. In 1638 one of the young and scholarly ministers of the colony died, leaving his library and a considerable sum of money to the college. He had been educated at Cambridge University in England, where the majority of the Puritan ministers were educated. Therefore the town, New Towne, in which the New England college had been founded, was named Cambridge; and the college was named Harvard College for its young benefactor, John Harvard. Thus to provide for a scholarly ministry for the churches was fully consistent with the creative principles of Puritanism.

Education, however, was not to be only for a superior class. The Puritans were establishing a new civilization upon principles which had long been their ideals, but which they never before had had freedom to apply; they were establishing their life upon the foundation of a book — that book, the Bible. But if a civilization be founded upon a *book* it is of the utmost importance that the entire population

shall be able to *read* the book. Very soon the Puritans saw that there must be education for the entire population; and accordingly they organized a system of public schools for all of the towns of the colony. Let us realize clearly that the first public schools in human history were in the Puritan colony of Massachusetts. In other countries education was the privilege of the few, but the Puritans saw that it was the duty of all. They established their public schools upon the principle that these schools should be supported at the cost of the whole community. Just as the Puritans were determined that political government should promote the welfare of the entire population, so they were determined to promote general education. They did not intend that in their new colony there should be any *poverty;* nor did they intend that there should be any *illiteracy.*

Not only should there be schools, but the Puritans realized that, in fulfilment of their intellectual principles, there should be at least a little library in every home. They believed in having the best books and as many as possible. Some of the finest private libraries in the

world at that time were owned by men who had joined in this great Puritan migration. Their scholarly ministers did not merely dictate to the people in a tone of authority. They encouraged debate. They wanted men not only to *believe* the truth declared from the pulpit, but to know *why* they believed. The scholars of the community did not form an exclusive group, but they sought to raise the average intelligence of the community, and to have as few as possible below the average. In promoting this idea of scholarship widely diffused, the Puritans brought from England the best printing press they could obtain and also brought trained printers. They established a book-publishing business in close association with Harvard College in Cambridge. Here was an idea that developed, after many years, into that of a university press. But even in its small beginnings this publishing business was a highly significant enterprise in the life of the young colony. It was consistent with the intellectual vigor of the founders of the colony and with their humane ideals that they made certain that they could produce any book which might serve their purpose. In England

the printing presses had been controlled by the authorities which were seeking to thwart the purposes of the Puritans. The Cambridge press, though limited in its possible output, kept open a door of intellectual progress.

Let us now review five great achievements of the Puritans in Massachusetts. The first is political democracy as expressed in their town meetings and their central colonial government. The second is spiritual self-reliance as expressed in their self-governing churches and in their religious life, which emphasized to the utmost the right of private judgment. The third is the ideal of an educated ministry as expressed in their creation of a college for the training of their own young men to fill their own pulpits, and in the application of the principle that their ministers should appeal to the intelligence of their congregations. The fourth is popular education as expressed in their great invention of the public school and the principle that the education of the children should be at the cost of the community, because it is for the welfare of all. The fifth was their publishing business which aimed to use the great invention of the printing press for the intel-

lectual and spiritual welfare of the entire population.

These five achievements were expressions of one dominant faith — their confidence in the powers of human personality. Those powers were to be developed to the utmost and applied to lifting the level of the life of the whole community. It was a new thing in the history of the race to create a government that made the welfare of the entire population its major concern. Everywhere else, men were contented to allow a part of the population to be submerged in hopeless degradation in order that the life of others might be built higher. To aim so to organize life that there should be no poverty, no illiteracy, no spiritual darkness, and no life left hopeless, was a magnificent purpose for which history offers no parallel. Though these beginnings were made in a little colony, the Puritan emphasis on this aim has raised the level of the ideals of the people of the North American continent.

Chapter VI

DEALING WITH DISSENTERS AND DELINQUENTS

The common interpretation of Puritanism is a direct reversal of the historical reality. It is doubtful if any important movement in history has ever been more completely misrepresented. A progressive people have been described as conservative. A movement for breadth is spoken of as narrow. The endeavor to develop and apply merciful and humane principles has been misrepresented as a movement for inhumane ways of doing things. Puritanism in England should be compared with the environing life of the same period. The Puritans in New England should be compared with the people who had been opposed to them in the homeland. This will show that the Puritan has been most unjustly accused of faults that were not his. To him have been attributed purposes which he did not *originate*

but which, indeed, he was endeavoring to *remedy.*

People who read the literature of early Puritan years in New England are likely to be impressed with the idea that laws were exceedingly harsh and punishments degrading. Critics of the Puritans cite the ducking-stool, the stocks, the pillory and the cage. These common devices were not *invented* by the Puritans but were *copied* temporarily from England and appear in colonial legislation. One excellent source of information concerning the actual operation of laws and the inflictions of punishments is old diaries, in which men have recorded what they have seen. There are careful students of early New England history who, after long search, are not convinced that there is conclusive proof that anybody in New England was ever put into a ducking-stool. If this form of punishment was actually used, the instances are rare.

Such punishments do not represent the real spirit of Puritanism. They were among the more humane devices for punishment in England at that time, and the Puritans in New England experimented with them. They

wanted to devise ways of appealing to public opinion in support of obedience to law. They adopted some forms of punishment which exposed the delinquents to public ridicule. The methods were crude, but the principle was correct; for the force of public opinion is the chief source of the strength of the law. In modern society we are still seeking ways to support wholesome laws by that force.

The laws enacted and the punishments used in New England by the Puritans reveal a humane purpose in contrast with the cruelties prevalent in other countries. In England at that time there were *two hundred* crimes and misdemeanors which carried the death penalty. It seems hardly believable that little boys were taken out and hanged for such trifling offenses as taking apples from orchards. Long and hopeless imprisonments were inflicted for debt. "Time was when slaves were exported like cattle from the British coast, and exposed for sale in the Roman market. These men and women, who were thus sold, were supposed to be guilty of witchcraft, debt, blasphemy or theft," says William Pitt. Puritanism in England was endeavor-

ing to *cure* such barbarities by the application of a higher sense of human worth. Puritanism in New England never *copied* such atrocities.

When a false statement has once been made, how likely it is to be repeated, and how difficult it is for the truth to overcome it! Even in reputable periodicals today we encounter the phrase, " when the Puritans burned witches on Boston Common." The phrase has become current and continues on its way. The true answer is a flat denial that the thing ever happened. The Puritans in New England did not burn anybody; and it is hardly becoming in Americans, who live in a time that is marked by lynchings and burnings of men, to repeat this slander of the Puritans.

In Puritan legislation there were very few crimes that carried the death penalty. In England at that time it was common for men to be mutilated and to be subjected to other cruelties too revolting even to be described here. For men to be thrown into prison " till they die and rot," or to be " hanged, drawn and quartered," shows not the humane spirit of Puritanism but an inhumane spirit surviving from a cruel age. When the New England

Puritan is compared with the life out of which he came, and is judged by those who really understand the historical situation, he appears as a messenger of mercy. The time has come for him to be set in the light of truth, in order that his noble humanism may be fully appreciated. Puritan law-making in New England shows a profound respect for human welfare and human rights. Archaic forms of punishment were soon rejected. When, at the end of the decade of the great migration, a code of laws was compiled, it bore the significant title, " The Body of Liberties." The emphasis was on freedom rather than restriction; and the contents of the code justify the title. The Puritan is to be judged not only by the point which he had reached in human progress, but by the direction in which he was moving. He was the forerunner of all that is most humane and progressive in modern times.

We read in old diaries and other records, that the Puritans went to public worship in midwinter and sat in unheated churches; and some people of today think this a proof of a spirit of severe asceticism. Let us recall that nowhere, in all the world, in those days did

men attempt to heat their churches. In many countries to this day no attempt is made to heat the larger buildings of public worship.

We read, in the records of early New England life, of crude methods of treating sick people. But let us recall that it was only three hundred years ago that so vital a fact as the circulation of the blood was discovered; and medical methods everywhere at that time were very primitive. The Puritans were not behind the times in such matters.

Were the Puritans archaic in dress? Judged by the styles of today they seem so, but in their own time they show a striking tendency to wear clothes according to the latest fashion. If at times there was legislation which put restrictions on extravagance, let us recall that men who were creating a new nation were willing to live under self-imposed limitations for the sake of their greater aims.

It is doubtful if any community had a higher standard of real happiness than did the Colony of Massachusetts Bay after the first arduous labor of the great migration was over. There was a stern moral code, but their life offered large satisfactions. These Puritans chose the

more lasting forms of pleasure rather than the temporary and the trivial. The feet that danced around the Maypole were not those

> " Whose stern impassioned stress
> A thoroughfare for freedom beat
> Across the wilderness."

It was a leader of the Pilgrims who said, " A great hope we had of laying some good foundations, yea, though we should be but as stepping-stones unto others." The Puritans could use the same utterance. Surely theirs was not a joyless life as they carried high the banners of so great an expectancy.

One of the most serious charges brought against the New England Puritans is that of religious intolerance and a spirit of persecution. It is commonly said that the Puritans came to New England in search of religious freedom and then denied to others what they sought for themselves. This statement contains two serious misinterpretations. In the first place the Puritan migration was impelled by the determination to establish a new life upon Puritan principles. It was a great experiment, and the leaders rightly desired to have time and opportunity to carry that ex-

periment through to a conclusion. They had never had the opportunity in England to create a Puritan State and to see if it would work. In New England they were determined to round out their purpose. They had invested their lives and all that they possessed in the world in that experiment, and they had the right to carry it through to completion. It was not an experiment in religious freedom but in the application of Puritan ideals to every department of their life.

The second misinterpretation in this accusation against the Puritans is that they persecuted other forms of faith simply because these forms differed from their own. There was a great deal of freedom of opinion within the Puritan State; but the officers of the State felt called upon to defend the very existence of their government when it was threatened by the *political* application of alien religious beliefs.

The founders of Massachusetts had to be watchful against danger from three directions. The very existence of the young colony was threatened. The settlers might be massacred by the savages who were not far away. If

the jealousy of the King of England were roused against the colony, his ships of war might appear in their harbors. The third danger might appear from within the colony itself; for internal strife might be fatal. It was quite possible that internal difficulties would so divide the forces of the colony that it could not defend itself from the Indians or from the King of England. These dangers caused great anxiety, and even in the first decade there was abundant reason for grave alarm. The Indians did threaten an invasion; King Charles I did demand the surrender of the charter and threaten the life of the colony; and religious debate reached such sharpness that it divided the military forces of the colony. Some of the settlers had to be banished lest the colony itself be destroyed. This coincidence of danger from three directions must be taken into account if we are to understand two famous religious debates which occurred in the first decade after the founding of Boston. Two very interesting figures appear at the centers of these storms: one was Roger Williams and the other Anne Hutchinson. They caused internal strife in Massachusetts

in those early years, and they are debated vigorously even in the present day. In the case of each of these people, the men at the head of the new government are charged with persecution because of religious prejudice. But a careful study of the historical situation shows that the life of the colony was in serious danger from these persons. The political meaning of these events is more important than the religious.

Such a movement as the Puritan migration inevitably attracted some people who would be restless in the new life and would be a source of weakness to it. Such a person was Roger Williams, of Welsh ancestry, born about 1604. His place of birth is uncertain. He was educated at Cambridge University, England, and became a clergyman of the Anglican Church. The Puritan migration fired his imagination, and he left the Anglican Church and came to Massachusetts in 1631. He was settled immediately as teacher of the church in Salem. He stirred up religious debate, which might have done no harm, had he not also denied, in important matters, the authority of the magistrates. He had to leave Salem in consequence

and went to the Colony of Plymouth. He was assistant pastor of the Plymouth church from 1631 to 1633. Then he was received again as pastor in Salem which indicates forbearance on the part of the Puritans in that church.

He began soon to disseminate alarming political views. One was that the charter of the colony was null and void, on the ground that King Charles I had no authority to grant it. If the charter was invalid, not one of the settlers owned the land on which his house stood, and all were trespassers on American soil. His questioning of the legal right of the king to grant the charter could be construed as treason. Matters were made worse by the rash act of one of his followers, who cut from the flag the royal emblem, the cross of St. George.

There was talk of sending Roger Williams back to England. Had that been done, probably the best he could have hoped for was to be hanged, drawn and quartered. But after a prolonged examination and trial he was ordered to leave the colony, which was an act of mercy. He was not required to hasten, but, after having abundant time to shape his plans, he went southward and founded Providence,

Rhode Island. His further story will be told in connection with the new colony which he established. When he had governmental responsibilities himself, he seems to have become a different man. He did constructive work in later years and left an abiding influence.

He is cited by critics of the Puritans as a man persecuted in Massachusetts for his religious opinions, and banished by bigoted men. His banishment was for political reasons, and was carried out only after he had been given ample opportunity to become a useful citizen of Massachusetts.

Before the critics of the Puritan magistrates interpret the banishment of Roger Williams as an act of religious persecution, they should understand the political situation. In the midst of the turmoil over the troublesome views of Roger Williams, King Charles I proceeded to take action aiming to destroy the colony. The alarming news reached Boston, and the government had to face the situation. Imagine the meeting of the General Court of Magistrates and Deputies when they sat around a long table on which was lying a copy of a document by which the king had given to eleven of

his courtiers the power to ruin them and all the other people of the colony.

These men who carried the responsibility for the safety of the colony took steps immediately to build fortifications at Dorchester, Charlestown and on Castle Island in Boston Harbor. The little army was recruited and actively trained. A council was appointed to manage " any war that might befall."

Facing the danger of war with the mother country, was it a time for broad toleration of a trouble-maker within the colony? If they must fill their powder barrels, should they let one man play with fire? The political situation must be taken into account in interpreting the case of Roger Williams in Massachusetts.

Seeds of another dissension were sown even while Roger Williams was cultivating the ideas he had planted in the Puritan garden. By a strange coincidence the same ship which brought the copy of the ominous document from England, threatening the very life of the colony, brought also a woman of great ability, Mrs. Anne Hutchinson. She could do much for the constructive life of the new community, or she could be an influence for strife and di-

vision. Events proved her to be the latter. She came in 1634 and had a picturesque career of four years. Though during her first months of residence in Boston she witnessed the feverish labors of fortifying Boston Harbor, and though she was keenly aware of the ominous influence of Roger Williams up to the time of his banishment, she carried forward her work which brought the colony even nearer to disruption. After the time of the departure of Roger Williams, the people of Boston were hoping for more peaceful times. The royal courtiers, who held in their hands the document which seemed to be the doom of Massachusetts, showed no energy in carrying out the royal purpose of destroying the governments of the American colonies. But hardly had this danger subsided when danger appeared from the opposite direction. There was fear of an invasion, in force, by the Indians, with the possibility of a general massacre. When this situation was most acute, there was division, even in the military forces of the colony, over the religious ideas of Anne Hutchinson. If these ideas could have been confined to the field of theological debate, she might have been

allowed to continue her agitation indefinitely. The Puritans loved debate over religious matters, and encouraged a variety of opinions. But internal division, extending to the army in time of threatened invasion, was a thing to be checked. At no time was the Massachusetts Colony nearer to collapse than when the agitation over Anne Hutchinson had reached its climax.

The story is very interesting and is important in the political development of the Puritan colony. The essentials of the religious ideas of this brilliant and dynamic woman can be stated briefly. The word "antinomian" seems to many minds to be mystifying; but its real meaning is simple. Its meaning is "against the (moral) law." The Puritan migration came at about the end of the first century of the strong tide of the Protestant Reformation. During that time, people had been agitated, to a tremendous degree, over the interpretation of the Bible. We have now a wealth of information, gathered from many sources, which helps in understanding the Bible: information which people lacked in the early years of the Reformation.

In the centuries before Christ, the Pharisees built up for the Jews a very elaborate system of ritual. They endeavored to regulate every day of a man's life, and all his conduct. Probably in no country, in all the world's history, has a more thorough attempt been made to bring life under an elaborate system of exact regulation. Jesus said of the Pharisees who enforced this system of ritual righteousness, "They bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne and lay them on men's shoulders." This whole system of repression and regulation was called "The Law." In the eyes of the Pharisees, the fulfilment of "The Law" was the equivalent of "righteousness."

Paul showed that, in the Christian faith, this ritual of the Pharisees was set aside. This is what he means by "The Law" being superseded in Christ. He taught that *fidelity* to the way of Jesus, loyalty to his life, was a higher obedience than a *ritual* "righteousness." He says, "Now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested" and "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law," and "That the right-

eousness of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit," and " The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God."

Not knowing the significance of Paul's education in the system of the Pharisees, after its strictest form, and his joy in freedom from its mechanical restrictions, many readers of the Bible have missed the meaning of his teaching and have mistaken the significance of what he says about freedom from " The Law." Uncounted thousands have supposed that he meant the *moral law.* They have asserted that there is a spiritual commodity, " the righteousness of God," which can be bestowed outright by the divine hand — just as a rich inheritance can be bestowed on a man who has never earned his own living.

There have been many people who, because of this interpretation of Paul's words, have declared themselves free from moral obligations; and that deeds which outwardly appear to be sinful are not, for them, sins because they have been lifted above the level of the moral law. Martin Luther devised the word " antinomian," which simply means " against the

(moral) law"; and "the anti-nomian controversy" raged for years, and has never really ceased during four centuries.

Anne Hutchinson held vigorously this interpretation of Paul's teaching. She not only declared herself to be in covenant with Christ through "grace" but to be under conscious divine guidance. She declared that the Holy Spirit dwelt in her and that she received revelations directly from the source of all truth.

Though her views were carried to an extreme, and she willingly stirred up dissension, she had laid hold of the important truth of modern Christian faith: that the final authority in religion is not the autocratic command of the Church, nor the literal word of the Bible, but the voice of the living God in the souls of all living human beings. But she asserted her claim to direct revelations so extremely that she defied all authority of the community in which she lived. She did not properly balance her inspiration with a sense of social obligation. She did not ask, "What would happen if everybody did as I do?" The answer is that there would be anarchy.

Yet the whole situation developed from

what seemed like a wonderful loyalty to her minister. She had lived in Alford near Boston in Lincolnshire, England. John Cotton was minister of the Boston parish and had a magnificent church. Though a Puritan, his influence in the Church of England was large. He was sympathetic with the plans for the great Puritan migration. When John Winthrop was ready to sail, in April 1630, a solemn service of worship was held on board the *Arbella* and John Cotton was the preacher. Soon this great Puritan preacher became an object of suspicion on the part of Archbishop Laud, who said that he " would like to meet up with Mr. John Cotton."

In 1633 the danger to Cotton became so serious that he fled in disguise, boarded a ship, and came to Boston, Massachusetts, where he was settled immediately as teacher in the first church, of which John Wilson was the influential pastor. Anne Hutchinson followed the next year for the one dominant reason that she wanted to be under the spiritual guidance of John Cotton.

On the same ship which brought Anne Hutchinson to Boston, came a Puritan minis-

ter named Symmes who soon became minister of the first church in Charlestown. The controversy over Anne Hutchinson's views started on board ship between these two passengers and continued after landing. When Mrs. Hutchinson applied for membership in the church in Boston, her admission was delayed, though John Cotton was one of its ministers.

This gifted woman began a work which at first appeared to be very helpful to the cause of religion. The men of the Boston church followed the custom of having a meeting between Sundays for the discussion of the sermons they had heard the previous Sunday. Debate was encouraged; and variety, rather than conformity, in faith, was the inevitable result. Anne Hutchinson started such meetings for women, and gathered weekly an audience limited only by the size of the place of the meeting. Often from sixty to a hundred were crowded together.

She was a real theologian, with a masculine vigor, and the gift of an exalted mysticism such as is sometimes revealed in women of rare power. As her work progressed, her views were carried to the whole population of the town,

and then to that of the entire colony. Nearly the entire membership of the Boston church supported her. Young Sir Harry Vane came to Boston in 1635, and, on a wave of popular enthusiasm, was elected Governor of Massachusetts in 1636. He was an ardent supporter of Anne Hutchinson.

The controversy stirred up by this brilliant woman led to the drawing of sharp lines. She defined her own following as living under a " covenant of grace " and her opponents as under a " covenant of works." Paul had said that obedience to ritual would not save any man; but his words were, " By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified." As interpreted by Anne Hutchinson the phrase " the deeds of the law " meant the moral law. Therefore she condemned all people whose convictions and practical good sense led them to assert that, whatever Paul said, they must keep the moral law as a Christian obligation. In those days it was a grave insult to any one to say that he sustained a " covenant of works "; but this insult was offered to the great majority of the clergy of the colony as well as to most of the general population.

Religious discussion was the chief intellectual exercise of the time, the very breath of the life of the people. There was no central ecclesiastical authority to enforce a creed, and no disposition on the part of the people to terminate debate. But the whole matter soon had political aspects that were ominous in the highest degree. A geographical circle was drawn, and there were strained relations between Boston and the rest of the colony.

Soldiers were being trained for the defense of the colony, but the army was divided over the controversy. Nearly all the Boston soldiers were ardent followers of Anne Hutchinson. The officers of the colonial government did not dare leave the general supply of arms and ammunition in Boston lest it be seized by the Boston faction. The members of the General Court, the governing body of the colony, deemed it wise to meet outside of Boston lest they be overpowered. Then came an acute crisis in an Indian uprising, and the danger of massacre. The Boston soldiers, declaring themselves to be under a " covenant of grace," refused to march against the savages under the command of a leader who, they declared, was

under a " covenant of works." There was the spectacle of a divided army with the enemy almost at the gates.

A session of the General Court was held on the common at New Towne (Cambridge). The Boston people hoped to dominate the meeting, but the representatives of the distant towns attended in force. The Boston church had prepared a petition sustaining Anne Hutchinson and attacking the general body of the clergy. When the General Court met in the open, a great crowd assembled. The young governor, Sir Harry Vane, then but twenty-five years old, sought to set aside the established order of business and to force immediately a vote approving this petition. Other men insisted on following the legal order and holding the annual election of officers. A great tumult broke out, and men came to blows. The venerable pastor of the Boston church, John Wilson, had previously been censured for taking a strong stand for law and order in opposition to his distinguished feminine parishioner. In the midst of this turmoil he climbed a tree, to be seen and heard by all, and made a vigorous speech appealing to men to

proceed in legal fashion and to unite in defense of the Commonwealth. His counsel prevailed; the young governor was swept from office, and the sane, sober, dependable John Winthrop was triumphantly returned to office as governor. The colony showed a united front against the savages, and the situation was saved.

The colony was learning rapidly that, while men had freedom for a variety of opinions, they must keep "the unity of the spirit." Of the "safe and sane" element of the clergy, which was nearly their whole number, one of the principal influences was Hugh Peter, the brilliant minister of the church in Salem. For some time he had been recognized as leader of this group in opposition to the governor, Sir Harry Vane. In a joint meeting of the clergy and magistrates of the colony, these two came face to face. Vane reproved the clergy for holding meetings without the civil authority; Hugh Peter rebuked the governor for restricting the liberty of the men of God, and told him that there had been peace in the colony until the young governor had disturbed it.

Thus these two men faced each other, seeking to establish the right relations of Church and State — a very great problem. Later both returned to England and did valiant work for religious liberty. Sir Harry Vane became the minister for naval affairs of the Commonwealth of England under Oliver Cromwell. Hugh Peter became Cromwell's chaplain. After the Restoration of the Stuart kings, Sir Harry Vane was beheaded, and Hugh Peter was hanged, drawn and quartered — martyrs both in the long contest for the liberties of the people.

But to return to Anne Hutchinson: the General Court saw clearly that the colony must defend its existence; that it could not hope to repel outside foes if its force were divided by civil strife. Mrs. Hutchinson was urged to moderate her propaganda. In Boston the good sense of the people reasserted itself, and the realization of the seriousness of danger from the Indians had a sobering effect. Mrs. Hutchinson was tried, but persisted in the assertion of her right of unrestrained utterance. The General Court decreed that she must be banished. This was not an act restricting re-

ligious liberty but one asserting the undeniable right of the government to defend its existence.

Whither was Anne Hutchinson banished? First to a very comfortable home in Roxbury, that of Joseph Welde, brother of the minister of the Roxbury church and a member of the General Court. There Mrs. Hutchinson lived for months in quiet, enjoying the visits of her friends; but, in discussing the recent strife, she made statements quite at variance with earlier utterances. These were declared by her critics to be falsehoods; but she could claim that her later statements came from a new revelation from the Holy Spirit. She did not have to be consistent and make them accord with her former statements.

As strife was continuing and taking the new form of a discussion of these conflicting statements by Anne Hutchinson, she was tried by the Boston church and excommunicated. When the day came for the trial, the people crowded the church and sat tense and eager as testimony was given and refuted, and arguments were made. The afternoon waned and twilight came. Candles were lighted, and the arguments continued. The trial lasted into

the night. At last the time came for sentence to be pronounced, and John Wilson, senior minister of the church, stood in his place, with the ominous document before him. The candles on the table partly illuminated his deeply furrowed face, and his figure cast a gigantic shadow on the wall behind him.

When, in very solemn words, the minister had read the sentence of excommunication, the condemned woman walked out into the deep darkness with an air of triumph, quoting Scripture and emphasizing the passage which says, "The Lord judgeth not as man judgeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh upon the heart."

By her side walked a young woman named Mary Dyer, an ardent friend and admirer. That circumstance will bring us presently to another story; meantime, we follow the course of Anne Hutchinson. Whither was she banished next? She went farther from Boston to her own farm in Braintree. There she could pause and consider her future course, for her destination was not chosen for her. She could go northward to the present site of the city of Portsmouth, New Hampshire, and share the

fortunes of her brother-in-law, John Wheelwright, who had been her partner and supporter in the strife and had been banished; or she could go southward to the present site of Providence and, with her little group of followers, associate herself with the followers of Roger Williams. She took the latter direction and settled at Aquednek, not yet named Rhode Island. There others joined her, and a permanent settlement was made. After some years, marked by further strife, she was driven forth by her energetic and restless spirit and met a tragic death at the hands of Indians in 1642.

Before terminating the story of this flaming spirit, let us see clearly that she was not banished for religious opinions but because she was endangering the government. In the address to her by the General Court is this clear statement: "Your conscience you may keep to yourself; but if in this cause you shall countenance and encourage those that transgress the law, you must be called in question for it; and that is not for your *conscience* but for your *practice*." Here is not a violation of freedom of conscience but a restriction on political

action endangering the existence of the Commonwealth.

Had Anne Hutchinson been born fifty years later and remained in England, it is probable that she would have become an ardent and aggressive leader of the Quakers who, as a definite sect, appeared in England about 1650. Had she lived in America in the nineteenth century, it is possible that she would have founded a new sect, characterized by a lofty mysticism. Her young disciple, Mary Dyer, who walked unflinchingly by her side on the night of her excommunication, did become a leader of the Quakers and was a martyr to that faith, dying on the scaffold on Boston Common, on the first day of June, 1660. This was about a quarter-century after the banishment of Anne Hutchinson. The events of these intervening years are highly significant, especially in their political aspects.

If readers of Puritan history consider mere *incidents* of the first decades of life in Massachusetts and *details* of legislation, without interpreting these things in the light of the major movements of the time, they are liable to infer that narrow-mindedness was a character-

istic of the Puritans. Such accusations were made and answered at the time. Very valuable testimony is found in the writings of Edward Winslow, who, though one of the Pilgrim Fathers, did valiant service for the colony of Massachusetts Bay. A defensive union of New England colonies was formed under the title, "The United Colonies of New England," and Winslow was one of the commissioners. Several times he was sent to England in the interests of Massachusetts and Plymouth.

He said, "If we in America should forbear to unite for offence and defence against a common enemy till we had leave from England, our throats might all be cut before the messenger would be half seas through."

Of Puritan legislation he made a defense against unjust accusations, saying —

> "The next aspersion cast upon us is that we will not suffer any that differ from us never so little to reside with us; to which I answer that our practice witnesseth the contrary. Against Anabaptists, it is true, we have a severe law, but

we never did or will execute the rigor of it upon any; and we have men living amongst us, nay, some in our own churches, of that judgment; and as long as they carry themselves peacefully, as hitherto they do, we will leave them to God, ourselves having performed the duty of brethren to them."

This reference to Anabaptists introduces an important episode in our story of the Puritans. What does the word mean? It means those who believe in being re-baptized. A common custom among the Puritans was to baptize infants when they were about eight days old. But there were many people who insisted that there was no true baptism except of persons old enough to make a profession of personal faith; and that any Christian, though baptized in infancy, should be re-baptized in mature years. Later their followers took the ground that infant baptism was not baptism at all; and they dropped the prefix of the old name and used simply the name Baptist, which has come down to the present day.

Back of this is a long and tragic history.

Four centuries ago, when the Protestant Reformation was at full tide, tens of thousands of people began to read the Bible, searching for the essentials of the Christian faith, and taking *parts* of the book in a very literal way. Reading the story of the first Christian church in Jerusalem, the members of which "had all things in common," thousands of people, believing that this presented the true plan of Christian living, endeavored to adopt a similar communism. Great social and economic confusion resulted. Others took very seriously the prophecy of the second coming of Christ to earth in visible form, and endeavored to fix the time and place of that appearance. A score of things connected with the Christian story in the New Testament were exalted into dominant principles.

Debates led to strife, and strife led to massacres and wars, in which thousands of people lost their lives. Germany, especially, was the scene of much bloodshed. At one time an Anabaptist leader named Matthys became convinced that the city of Münster was the New Jerusalem, and that the time was at hand when Christ would come again, in bodily form,

and set up the kingdom of God. He invited all oppressed Anabaptists thither. Thousands crowded within the ancient walled city, with no adequate means of livelihood. Their enemies besieged the city and, after a year of unspeakable misery, captured it. One of the most terrible massacres in all history took place. This was in 1535, about a century before the founding of Boston.

One of the principles of the Anabaptists was that civil law must not be enforced by magistrates against Christian believers; but after the Münster massacre, they were persecuted as if they were dangerous anarchists. The movement was almost obliterated, but early in the next century was revived in less fanatical form. With this revival, under the name of Baptist, there was a partial revival of the old prejudices against the sect, surviving from the previous century.

This accounts for the statement of Edward Winslow, "Against Anabaptists we have a severe law." At the time of the founding of Boston, Baptists held pronounced views regarding the freedom of Christian believers from restrictions by civil authorities, and the

complete separation of Church and State. Such doctrines, if pushed to the extreme, might have made trouble in such a colony as Massachusetts, where the government was in process of development.

There were sharp differences between Puritan and Baptist doctrines. The view of baptism which prevailed among churches of the Reformation was that baptism was a means of regeneration, and so all infants should be baptized. This was the Puritan custom. Baptists asserted strenuously that the only true baptism was that of adults who thus signified their personal profession of faith.

In Massachusetts the Puritans might have permitted Baptists to practice their religious rites in their own ways, had they not derived from their *religious* doctrines serious *political* theories. Baptists increased in numbers in the new colony. Some of the influential Puritans adopted Baptist principles. Henry Dunster, first president of Harvard College, became convinced that the Baptist view was correct; and this created great consternation among the Puritan leaders.

The Puritans of Massachusetts restricted

the suffrage to those whom they regarded as Christian men. The test was membership in the Puritan churches; but as these men had been baptized in infancy, their Baptist neighbors declared that not one of them was truly a Christian. So far the matter was wholly in the field of *religious* debate. But the Baptists went one step further and declared that if the suffrage were to be in the hands of none but true Christians the Puritans had no right to vote in town meetings or on colonial matters. If this doctrine had been pushed to its logical conclusion, it would have disfranchised all the Puritans and put the power in the hands of the Baptists.

Thus we see that the Puritans felt justified in enacting severe restrictive laws against the Baptists, not because of *theological* differences but because Baptists made *political* application of their doctrines. Let us realize also that, in those days, many men took their religion with a life-and-death earnestness. Any man who had a strong conviction that he had possession of eternal truth was likely to regard men of other faiths as being in hopeless error. They had not learned the modern view that

neighbors of widely differing faiths may live in peace and goodwill, and work together for the good of the community.

In spite of restrictions and handicaps, the Baptists established themselves in Boston. The third oldest church organization in the city is the First Baptist Church, founded in 1665.

Having very strong convictions, those people in Massachusetts who were of the Baptist faith did not ask merely to be let alone. Some of them endeavored to enforce their views aggressively in the Puritan churches by creating a disturbance when, on Sunday morning, an infant was brought forward during the service for baptism. Yet the persecution of Baptists was partly a matter of the personal attitude of the man who was governor. One who was active in such persecution was Governor Bellingham who died in 1672. His successor was Governor Leverett, under whose administration the persecution of Baptists ceased and the laws against them were not enforced. Yet through these troubled years, the restrictions put upon the members of the sect were not primarily because of differences of religion but

because the logical conclusion of the Baptist doctrine was believed to be a menace to the fabric of the government of the Puritan colony. This was not so much a religious persecution as it was a political policy.

Reference has already been made to the martyrdom of Mary Dyer as a Quaker. The further story can be told briefly, as illustrating principles already set forth. As has been said, the sect of Quakers arose in England about 1650. Let us realize that, in those days, any sect was practically certain to be opposed by people of other sects. In order to have any hope of existence it must be militant, at least in its own defense. If aggressive against others, it might gain ground in addition to that on which it already stood. Though opposed to war, the early Quakers were by no means lacking in spiritual militancy. They were very aggressive in their propaganda; and so they were persecuted in every country in which they endeavored to establish their faith.

At first the Quakers called themselves " The Children of the Light." From the first they refused to take oaths, bear arms or render military service. They believed that war could be

dispensed with, and that they had spiritual weapons more formidable than armies. They were far from being meek and passive. Their views about government were believed, by their opponents, to tend toward anarchy.

Quakers first appeared in Boston in July 1656, the same month in which John Norton became minister of the First Church of Boston. He was a melancholy and gloomy man. In 1629, in Salem, John Endecott had banished two members of the Church of England without waiting for any law; and he was now Governor of Massachusetts. The Deputy-Governor was Bellingham, afterwards notable, as we have seen, as the governor who most actively persecuted the Baptists. These three men were thus in positions of influence and were stern and harsh in their personal views. They were not typical representatives of Puritanism, and this humane movement should not be, though it often is, misinterpreted because of the actions and utterances of such men.

After the first appearance of Quakers in Boston in 1656, they began to make the most persistent attempts to gain a foothold in the several New England colonies, in spite of laws

prohibiting their entrance. Some who attempted to land in Boston and were examined by the Governor, showed, according to a famous historian, "the proficiency of the sect in the use of approbrious language"; and one of them, Mary Prince, addressed Endecott and two of the Puritan ministers of Boston as "hirelings, Baals, and seed of the Serpent."

Mary Dyer had followed Anne Hutchinson to Rhode Island. Her husband became the Secretary of that colony. She went to England, and found that what she had learned from Mrs. Hutchinson about the indwelling of the Holy Spirit anticipated the Quaker doctrine of the Inner Light. Twenty years after her departure from Massachusetts, Mary Dyer appeared in Boston on her way from England. This was in the year 1657. Being then a Quaker, she had come in spite of the law. She was sent home to Rhode Island.

A law had been passed in Massachusetts that a troublemaker who returned after being twice banished should be put to death unless he renounced his errors. No one had ever had to be executed under this law. By a bare majority of one vote such a law was enacted

against the Quakers. Public sentiment was strongly against such a law, whatever the danger of trouble from the Quakers, and the real spirit of Puritanism was too humane for its enforcement.

Four Quakers, claiming to be acting under the direct command of the Holy Spirit, came to Boston courting martyrdom. Being banished, they returned, thus challenging the magistrates to enforce the law. One of them, a woman, walked boldly up to the Governor and displayed some linen sheets, declaring that they were to be used as winding-sheets for those who were to be martyrs.

On the one hand was Endecott, who was rigid in demanding the enforcement of the law; and on the other hand were the unwelcome Quakers, who were determined to win the martyr's crown. But when four had been hanged, the humane spirit of Puritanism rose in revolt and insisted that the Governor recede from his position. Endecott threatened to leave the colony, but he had to concede that he was beaten. This event ended such scenes in Boston. Though the government had proceeded on the principle that it was not perse-

cuting Quakers for their religious ideas but suppressing men and women who menaced the Commonwealth, public opinion declared that, whatever the danger, there should be no more executions of this kind.

Having reviewed this situation, let us look into the future. As has been said, the statement is wholly untrue that "The Puritans burned witches on Boston Common." There are critics of the Puritans who seem to hold the opinion that the Puritans invented witchcraft and also originated the idea of putting witches to death. In the "witchcraft craze" at Salem, nineteen persons were put to death but not tortured. Everywhere in Christendom, people believed in the reality of witchcraft. What happened in Massachusetts has been cited as proof that the Puritans were "given to bigotry, cruelty and superstition." On the contrary, Massachusetts showed itself to be one of the most humane and enlightened communities in the world by its record in the matter of witchcraft. At a time when, in other lands, tens of thousands of people were tortured and killed by horrible methods as witches, Massachusetts was comparatively free of this

delusion. Though the Bible says explicitly, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live," people in Massachusetts said, after one brief outbreak of witch-killing, "No matter what the Bible says, this thing shall not be repeated." Judge Samuel Sewall, one of the presiding judges at the witchcraft trials, stood in the broad aisle of his church in Boston and before God and man declared that he repented humbly of his sin in sending any one to death as a witch, and asked for pardon.

Though an occasional individual such as Dudley, Endecott, or Bellingham, who were governors, might display a personal harshness, the general record of Massachusetts Puritans is one of kindliness, mercy and breadth of mind. Puritanism was, at times, terribly in earnest, but it was making a significant experiment in the finest kind of humanism. Fortunately, when serious crises followed in rapid succession, there were men of wisdom to guide public affairs; and the experiment was carried through to success, even beyond the dreams of these idealists.

Chapter VII

COLONIAL GOVERNMENTS LOCAL AND CENTRAL

The pattern of the constitution of the American Republic began to take form in the very first years of the Puritan settlement of the colony of Massachusetts Bay. To the originality of thought of a few men among the Puritan leaders, this Republic owes a debt which has never been fully acknowledged. One of these men was John Winthrop, who served the colony as governor for eleven years of the first twenty of its existence. During all that score of years he was devoted to the welfare of the colony, in whatever ways he had opportunity of rendering service. When his policies were opposed, when he was confronted by personal misunderstandings, and even when he was forced out of the position of governor, he showed great patience and breadth of mind; and he was as willing to render humble service for the colony as to exercise authority in its government.

His wife, Margaret Winthrop, was a rare soul, a woman of unusual vigor of mind and strength of character. The affection of these two makes one of the most beautiful love stories of human history. If English life three centuries ago seems harsh and Puritanism itself austere, the story of John and Margaret Winthrop is like golden sunshine across a bleak and rugged landscape.

It was in August 1629, at the time of the signing of the Cambridge Agreement, that Winthrop knew that he was to leave England, make a new home in the American wilderness, and be governor of a colony not as yet created. To his care was entrusted the precious charter, which had been granted by King Charles I in the preceding March. From August 1629 till April 1630, the newly chosen governor was deeply absorbed in preparations for the momentous voyage.

He was well qualified, by personal character and long discipline in Puritan principles, to lead the great migration and to lay the foundations of the new government. He was born in England in 1588, the year in which the king of Spain sent the great Armada to destroy the

government of Queen Elizabeth. He grew up during the years when the naval power of England was expanding, and she was becoming the mistress of the seas. His boyhood imagination was illuminated by heroic tales of exploration and of adventure in distant lands. He was a lad of fifteen when King James I came to the throne of England. During the next quarter-century he had an intense interest, and took an increasingly active part, in the heroic fight of the Puritans against royal autocracy and for the rights of the English people. He was educated at Cambridge University with several men who became Puritan ministers. At the age of forty-two years, when he was in the prime of life, came suddenly this call to assume a very grave responsibility, and to render an important public service.

Strength of character and grace of spirit were blended in his personality. His unusual natural intelligence was disciplined by his thorough education. But he kept a sensitiveness and modesty of spirit; and these qualities were united with a capacity for patient loyalty to ideals even when such loyalty involved great hardship. He was typical of the best

elements of the Puritans of three centuries ago. With an intensely religious nature were united a truly charitable disposition and a marked liberality in opinion.

During the months of his preparations for the voyage to New England, he had to look after the enormous business interests of the enterprise and also to adjust his private affairs. He was a man of wealth, and it was a serious thing to transplant his life from England to the American wilderness. Margaret Winthrop remained in England a year after her husband's departure, and then she followed him in 1631. Fortunately the letters that passed between these two during this year of separation have been preserved. Not only do they reveal a love of great strength, which is expressed with unusual tenderness, but there is also the revelation of a fine mysticism in the religious faith of both of them. Though months were required for written communication, they agreed to observe fixed times of meditation and spiritual communion. This is revealed in one of John Winthrop's letters in which he says, " Mondays and Fridays, at five of the clock at night, we shall meet in spirit

till we meet in person." Between these lovers lay three thousand miles of the stormy Atlantic and the hardships and hazards of a voyage of months. But their mystical faith and experience transcended distance and time; and these two gentle spirits kept loyally their sacred tryst, until they had the joy of being together again.

Winthrop's intense religious faith, in which he is typical of the best of Puritanism, made him a great and faithful public servant. Though deeply mystical, he was not unduly introspective. He did look into his own soul to find the marks of a true disciple of Christ. Yet his great concern in attaining Christian character was not that he might stand in saintly solitude but that he might gain the power to fulfill the divine will in the world.

In her new life in Boston, Margaret Winthrop was truly the type of a Puritan saint — the kind of saint that wears homespun, goes about among people in need, and does obscure deeds of human helpfulness. Many people who came to New England sacrificed comfortable homes in the mother country, and suffered privation until they had established themselves

in the new life. Sometimes Margaret Winthrop's kindly heart surmised that the courageous pride of some of the new arrivals in Boston led them to conceal their lack of the necessities of life. She made neighborly calls on the people who came, establishing new homes; and she used her keen eyes to good effect. Sometimes, under cover of darkness, she would leave, upon the threshold of such a home, the necessities of life, relieving their privation and respecting their pride. They might never know that when the spirit of Christ had walked in the darkness, he had used the feet of Margaret Winthrop in going upon his errand, and her gentle roughened hands in fulfilling his purpose.

John Winthrop has rendered a priceless service to those who, in later years, have desired to know the human side of the great migration and the story of the founding of the new government. He kept a faithful "Journal," and this in an era when the keeping of a diary was sometimes raised to the level of literary art. His writing is done with candor and sincerity, and he shows a desire to record events just as they transpired. The record

begins on Easter Monday, March 29, 1630, when Winthrop was on board the ship *Arbella,* waiting for the little fleet to be ready to sail for New England. The simple details of wind and weather are recorded, as are other observations during the voyage. When the first ship of the fleet arrived in Salem Harbor, it waited there till several others had arrived. On Thursday, June 17, 1630, John Winthrop's record says, "We went up to Mattachusetts to find out a place for our sitting down." This entry, in quaint language, introduces his story of Boston, the future capital of the Commonwealth.

John Winthrop was often misunderstood and has suffered also at the hands of interpreters of Puritan history. He shows a rare capacity for tact in dealing with men, and flexibility in changing his plans to meet difficult situations. His desire to be humane has led men to declare that he was lax in enforcing his authority in government; and his strong will, which had to be exercised in a crisis, has been interpreted as evidence of an arrogant spirit.

It cannot be said too emphatically that, in the first years of the Colony, Winthrop was

keenly aware that he was conducting an *experimental* government. He looked out on flowing streams of migration. Practically the whole population of a town might rise up and move to a new location, even going outside of his jurisdiction as abruptly as they had come in. Yet the governor has been criticized for not putting the ultimate authority into the hands of the people immediately. Some students of history have asserted that he was essentially an aristocrat with a desire for arbitrary power. Yet it is probable that no man did more than he, in the course of the first twenty years of Massachusetts, to make the government essentially democratic. The increasing stress of public affairs in England during those years from 1629 to 1649 was cause for grave anxiety in New England; and governmental affairs in the colonies could not be put upon a permanent basis while the English government was going through a time of upheaval. We may well remember that, when John Winthrop died on March 26, 1649, ships were nearing Boston Harbor with the news that King Charles I of England had been beheaded. Thus the period of service of Win-

throp to the Colony, lay between the date when King Charles dissolved Parliament in 1629, resolved to rule England as an arbitrary sovereign, and the date when, in 1649, he paid the penalty for that act with his life. Massachusetts was fortunate in having the steadying influence of Winthrop during all that time, and having him as governor during the greater part of it.

One of the serious and urgent problems which confronted Winthrop, in his first months on New England soil, was that of adapting the charter of a trading company to that of a self-governing colony. In those days, the general manager of a trading company might be designated "Governor"; and the Massachusetts charter provided for a Governor, a Deputy-Governor and a board of Assistants. The charter created a corporation, the members of which were called "Freemen." They were the stockholders in the corporation, and they could increase their own number. In the Virginia Company, such stockholders were called the "generality." In Massachusetts, the charter provided for a meeting, every three months, of all the stockholders or Freemen. It was the

governmental authority of the colony. The Freemen elected annually the Governor, and other officers, and the Assistants; and these formed a council which was responsible for carrying on the actual work of government. This council met monthly.

If the colony had been one compact settlement, and its numbers small, it would have been a practicable plan to continue to hold quarterly meetings of all the Freemen to vote on major governmental matters. But in 1630 enough people came to establish six towns; and this precipitated the problem of six local governments, of their relationship one to another, and the relationship of all to the government of the colony as a whole.

The Plymouth Colony had, at first, no such problem. The Pilgrims founded one town, and it was the entire colony. Only later did they have the problem of the relationships of a group of towns. The Massachusetts settlers, deciding to establish their several towns "in dispersion," plunged immediately into the problem of forming a federation of self-governing communities.

The men of Plymouth not only had plenty

of time in which to take up the problem of central and local governments, but they had *no charter* at all for more than seventy years, and then they were united with Massachusetts. While a charter might have given them a feeling of security it would have limited their freedom. They started their experiment in government with a meeting of the men who were migrating. In the cabin of the *Mayflower,* the men signed the famous compact, which was an agreement that they would create a government in the colony and would obey the laws which should be enacted.

Looking superficially at the problems of creating new governments, there have been students of history who have said: "The Pilgrims did the democratic thing. Why did not the Puritans proceed in the same democratic fashion?" The Pilgrims, having no charter and not even a claim to the land on which they were about to colonize, had to start with the rights of the common people; but the Puritans had a royal charter, and, whether they wanted to or not, they had to start with the authority of the king. The charter assigned them their geographical limits and prescribed the

method by which their government should be carried on.

By people who fail to make this distinction, John Winthrop has been spoken of as "essentially an autocrat." It should be remembered, however, that he had to make a beginning by royal authority. He had to manage a huge financial investment and to guard the material interests of a large number of people. We speak truly when we say that it was his serious duty to *conserve* these interests; one who must *conserve* has to be *conservative*. And yet Governor Winthrop was very progressive in spirit. The great difficulties of his position should be appreciated. He must avoid, if possible, arousing the suspicions of the king; and he must satisfy, if practicable, thousands of people who were "land-hungry." His sagacity and his democracy are both amazing. He was truly a statesman, and he had a very remarkable gift of personal tact in dealing even with troublesome individuals.

Forced to begin their government with the recognition of the authority of the king of England, the Puritans created, in a few years, what was practically a self-governing republic.

Unable to start, as did the Pilgrims, with the rights of the people, but required to establish a central government by royal authority, the Puritans deserve the highest praise for reversing that situation. In a surprisingly short time they had put so much elasticity into the charter that it could be interpreted to mean almost exactly the opposite of what its provisions appeared to be. It is evident that the original framers of the charter, having in mind a self-governing Puritan colony, were shrewd enough to be vague about some things and silent about others. It was a piece of great good fortune that they got the charter approved with no provision at all concerning the seat of government. The King thought it would be England; the Puritans intended it to be America.

As Winthrop had been made Governor in August 1629, the first anniversary of that date came in the first summer of the great migration. It was a highly significant event when the Freemen of the new colony met and held their first election on American soil. The rapid progress of the colony toward self-government is strikingly evident when we recall that within five years it had fortified itself against Eng-

land, had quietly defied the king, and had appointed a council to carry through a possible "war" with the mother country. Instead of representing Winthrop and the other founders of Massachusetts as too conservative and too autocratic, we have reason for amazement that, before the great migration was half over, their little capital had earned the haughty title of "Rebel Boston."

In October 1630 the leaders saw the difficulty of bringing all the Freemen together for their quarterly meeting; and the Freemen were willing that the colonial officers and the existing Board of Assistants should proceed with governmental matters. In a few months, many of the Freemen were of the opinion that the Assistants might continue in office "during good behavior." This looked in the direction of having a governing class; but this tendency was soon checked, for the problem of the assessment of taxes came up in an acute form.

The first general study of the coast by Winthrop and his associates led to the plan of establishing a fortified capital inland. New Towne (now Cambridge) was favored, and Winthrop planned to build his house there.

To pay the cost of fortifications, the colonial officers and Board of Assistants assessed a tax on the people, assigning each town its share.

Here was a problem that would stir up any community of Englishmen who were alive to the issue of taxation by a power above them. The men of Watertown led a movement of protest: not against fortifying the capital, and not against paying for necessary fortifications, but against the manner in which the tax was voted. They asserted that they could not rightly be taxed without their own consent. In this they were asserting what Englishmen had asserted for many generations.

Out of this incident, local though it was, and minor in the amount of money involved, came the movement which really shaped American constitutional government. The men of all the towns saw clearly the issue involved. Though matters were so adjusted that the tax was paid, the colonial leaders saw that the final authority in government must be in the hands of the common people. Government must not be left to a central group. The citizens of the Commonwealth must participate in local and central government, even though a meeting

of all the Freemen would be too unwieldy. Within two years was developed the plan of having a thoroughly representative body in the central government. Instead of attempting any general meeting of all the Freemen of the colony, the Freemen of each town elected deputies to represent them in the government.

Let us see clearly the situation, for it involved principles of the utmost importance. At first, under the royal charter, all the Freemen met and elected the Governor, Deputy-Governor and eighteen Assistants. The election was held annually. These men constituted really a Governor's Council. The Freemen were to meet every three months; and the colonial officers and Assistants every month. Then when the plan was adopted of having each town elect its deputies, the Freemen were not called together. Instead of having such a "primary assembly," they had their representative body to legislate on their behalf. The question comes to our minds, What was the essential difference between being represented by the Assistants and being represented by the Deputies? There was a good deal of difference. The Assistants nominated their own

successors, but the Freemen of each town nominated their own Deputies. When an election was held, the names of men nominated as Assistants were presented to all the Freemen of the colony, meeting in their annual town meetings. Each town, having made its own nominations for Deputies, held its own election uncontrolled by any outside body. Thus the Assistants were inclined to nominate men of prominence, and to perpetuate a more conservative policy. The Deputies were more democratic and had especially the duty of preventing the government from becoming too centralized.

When the colony first adopted the plan of having the towns represented by Deputies, there was only one legislative body; for the Assistants and the Deputies sat together. But by the year 1644 there were two chambers, and the pattern of government had been established which was to continue. The Assistants and Deputies constituted "The Great and General Court." Their powers were judicial as well as legislative, as had been the powers of the Board of Freemen from the beginning. In Massachusetts the legislative body is still

the Great and General Court. The present Senate is successor to the Assistants, and the House is successor to the Deputies.

In the early years in Massachusetts the experiment was made, for a time, of allowing the Assistants to elect the Governor and Deputy-Governor; but when the plan of representative government was worked out, these highest officers of the Commonwealth were elected by the Freemen. Thus the real power of government was in the hands of the voters of the towns, for they chose the officers, the Assistants and the Deputies. The men who met locally in town meeting really controlled the central government. Thus there could be no "taxation without representation," and the ancient English principle was vindicated.

A similar thing had happened in England centuries before. In 1215 the nobles had forced King John to sign the Magna Carta; and after that the nobles held meetings to participate in government and see that the provisions of the charter were observed. Gradually they admitted representatives of the common people, who for some years sat with the nobles; but a half century after the signing of

the Magna Carta, the English House of Commons was recognized as having a definite existence. We have a word which reminds us of that transition period: the word "Speaker" as the name of the presiding officer of a parliamentary body. Since he is to preside and not participate in debate, why is he called the Speaker? The answer is that in England, in the transition period, a question which concerned vitally the representatives of the common people might be referred to them for an opinion. They would withdraw from the general assembly and meet as the house of the common people. When they were ready to report their decision, their presiding officer would be authorized to *speak* on their behalf. He was thus their *speaker;* and, when next they met, this speaker took the chair again. It is significant that this name has come down through seven centuries. This suggests how persistent men of English stock have been in maintaining the tradition of English parliamentary procedure.

In the early years of the Massachusetts Colony, men had difficulty in balancing the limitations of the charter against the growing power

of democratic principles. It is impressive to read of some of the towns sending men to Boston to read the charter, and then to refresh the memories of their neighbors as to the provisions of that document. Soon the people had established the pattern of a republic, regardless of the charter.

Reference has been made in the preceding chapter to the coming of John Cotton to Boston. By an interesting coincidence, the same ship brought also Thomas Hooker. It is impossible to say which was the man of greater ability. They were brilliant scholars, both had graduated from Cambridge University in England, had been settled as ministers of the established church of England, been persecuted for nonconformity, and were recognized as leaders of the Puritan movement. Both were spiritually minded preachers and were declared by Anne Hutchinson to be under a " covenant of grace " when she was condemning almost the entire number of Massachusetts clergymen as under a " covenant of works."

As has been said, John Cotton settled in Boston as teacher of the church there, John Wilson being the pastor. Thomas Hooker

was called to the church in New Towne as pastor. With him, as teacher, was associated Samuel Stone, another Puritan minister who had come on the same ship with Cotton and Hooker. An example of Puritan humor, directed even at dignified ministers, was the remark that with the coming of Hooker, Cotton and Stone, they were assured of fish, clothing and building material.

Cotton and Hooker were soon regarded as representing opposite tendencies in government. Whether Cotton was or was not essentially autocratic in spirit, he did speak on behalf of the need of a strong central government. Hooker voiced the ideas of the men of Watertown and other towns who wanted to guard local rights. Cotton had the Governor as his principal parishioner, and his church was in the capital. He did important work in drawing up a legal code for the colony. Thus he saw the necessity for a stable central government for the whole colony.

Even from a little distance, Hooker saw all that Cotton saw; but he was perfectly clear in his own mind that the real authority should be in the hands of the common people, for they had

the right to rule. There should be no governing class. On the other hand, the logic of Cotton led him to say, "If the people be the governors, who shall be the governed?" He might have answered his own question by saying that the people should exercise *self-government;* and thus they would be both the governors and the governed.

The contrast in the tendencies of these two men illustrates one of the great problems of American government. Does government begin at the top, and is power handed down to the common people? Or does government begin with the common people and is authority delegated by them to their representatives who sit in the central government? These questions were vital from the beginning of American constitutional government, as they are today. Hooker and Cotton personified two tendencies among a few people and in a limited area. Jefferson and Hamilton personified them among a greatly increased number of people and in a vaster territory. Hooker was right in his day of small beginnings; and Jefferson, who took the same attitude as Hooker, was right in the momentous days when the Ameri-

can Republic was being formed. Jefferson, the real author of the Declaration of Independence, was indebted to Hooker for what that pioneer had said in the early days of New England.

This contrast in views between Hooker and Cotton was soon dramatized. Hooker had heard of the spacious unoccupied areas of land in the valley of the Connecticut River. He planned a migration thither and petitioned the General Court of Massachusetts for permission to go. He pointed out that in New Towne the pasture land was limited. After stating economic reasons for migration, he gave another comprehensive reason; namely, "the strong bent of their spirits to remove thither." He was too diplomatic to refer to Cotton's views of government, but we may safely assume that Hooker's clear ideal of democratic government was what gave his own spirit its "strong bent" toward this migration.

After gaining the reluctant consent of the colonial government, Hooker organized his expedition. Some of the people started in 1635, but the greater number went in the early summer of 1636. Almost the entire congrega-

tion of Hooker's church in New Towne went with him; also a large part of the Watertown church led by a minister of their choice, Henry Smith; and a large group from the Dorchester Church led by their minister, William Wareham.

These three groups, from Cambridge, Watertown and Dorchester, founded three towns in the Connecticut Valley: Hartford, Wethersfield and Windsor. Hooker was the guiding spirit of the migration, and the organizing genius of their new life. They found themselves to be outside of the jurisdiction of the Colony of Massachusetts. They had no grant of land, and so they took possession of land unoccupied by others. They had no charter, so they organized their government according to the ideals of their leader, Hooker. Within a year there were eight hundred people who had migrated to these three new towns in the Connecticut Valley.

They organized their town governments, and then, after due deliberation, the towns chose their deputies to create a General Court. This court held its first session on May 31, 1638, and thus created a colonial government.

By these steps, taken under the direct guidance of Thomas Hooker, the colony of Connecticut came into existence. On January 14, 1639, a great meeting of all the Freemen of the colony was held in Hartford, and a written constitution was adopted as the foundation of the colony. At the first meeting of the General Court, in 1638, Hooker preached an epoch-making sermon in which he declared that "the foundation of authority is laid in the free consent of the people." In this and other striking sentences he set forth clearly the principle that the people may create a central government; but that it possesses only such powers as are delegated to it by that authority which created it, and to which it is responsible; namely, the people.

To the person who looks casually at what Hooker was doing, it may seem like an unimportant event when the citizens of three little towns adopted a brief written statement as the foundation of their government. In reality it was a very great event, and differed from anything that had happened in the world up to that time. Men rightly feel that the signing of the Magna Carta in 1215 was a great event.

It substituted a written document for the will of an autocratic king, but it did not create a new government. The signing of the Compact in the cabin of the *Mayflower* by the Pilgrims was a great event; but it was not a constitution for a government. It was an agreement to proceed to organize a government, and that was done subsequently. But in Connecticut a written constitution was adopted and on it a government was built: and this was the first time this had ever been done. Thomas Hooker was the creative genius of this immortal document and this significant government. Recall that these men of Connecticut had settled in the wilderness, with no grant of land, and no charter from the king. Their constitution is called the " Fundamental Orders of Connecticut." It makes *no reference* to any existing *government,* and is not based on any royal authority. If ever there was a perfectly clear case of a people acting on the primary rights of the common people, it is this action of Hooker and his people in Connecticut.

The importance of Hooker's work is not minimized at all by the fact that he was dealing with a few people and organizing a government

for only a little colony. His principles were great enough to furnish the pattern, in later time, for the government of the American Republic. Whatever the increase of the number of our people and the growth of our territory, our government continues the plan and pattern created by the genius of Hooker.

He organized local governments, and the local governments delegated certain powers to the central government. But all powers not definitely delegated to the central government were retained by the local governments; that is, they were retained in the hands of the people. In Hooker's plan of local and central governments there was stability; for when the local governments had acted together, creating their central government, they had entered into a *sacred contract,* and no one of the local governments could set aside this contract. They respected this obligation.

Hooker's principles appear in the Articles of Confederation of the United States in these words: "Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right, which is not by this Confederation expressly delegated to the

United States in Congress assembled." It is further declared that " the said States hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other "; that these Articles of Confederation " shall be inviolably observed by the States we respectively represent, and that the Union shall be *perpetual.*"

Thus a group of sovereign States, retaining local authority, entered into a *perpetual* Union. The major problem of American government has always been to preserve a proper balance between local and central governments. The essential principle was clarified by the work of Abraham Lincoln. He had to deal with a group of States which, by their acts of secession, endeavored to set aside the *perpetual contract* into which they had entered with the other States of the Union. Even in endeavoring to defend their acts of secession, the Confederate States showed a strange inconsistency. Taking up arms on the plea of " State's rights," they had to grant immediately to their central government the absolute authority to assess taxes and conscript men and all other resources. Otherwise their cause would have had no hope of success. A strong central government had

to be acknowledged, from the authority of which the states could not secede at will. When, after the defeat of the Civil War, the Confederate States were once more in the Federal Union, they were as free as they had been in their own Confederacy.

Hooker's words must have influenced Jefferson. Hooker declared that governmental authority is in "the free *consent* of the people"; Jefferson, in the Declaration of Independence, speaks of governments as "deriving their just powers from the *consent* of the governed." The use they make of the word *consent* is highly significant. From Hooker to Jefferson, and from Jefferson to Abraham Lincoln, the lines of influence can be traced clearly. In an immortal statement of the problem which confronted him, Lincoln said: "It is the eternal struggle between these two principles — right and wrong — throughout the world. They are the two principles that have stood face to face from the beginning of time, and will ever continue to struggle. The one is *the common right of humanity* and the other is *the divine right of kings.*" That was the problem of the Puritans three centuries

ago, and the problem of Thomas Jefferson in the time of the winning of American independence. The debt which the American Republic owes to Thomas Hooker has never been adequately acknowledged.

Chapter VIII

SOURCES OF PURITAN CULTURE

When the Puritans first arrived in New England, the imperative necessity was to provide shelter from the elements. They built their earliest homes and their first churches according to their memories of structures in the mother country. They used such materials as were at hand, and experimented in what could be done with these materials to meet the changed conditions of wilderness life and a climate much more severe than that of the country in which they had been reared. Thus we must not look for anything distinctive in architecture in the few structures that still remain which were built in their earliest years.

Imagine, however, a visitor traveling about in New England when colonial life had had a few decades in which to develop. He comes, let us suppose, from a distant land and knows nothing of the spirit of New England life.

He would find something very impressive in a typical New England village: a little village green and, facing it, a school, a town house, and a church. Not knowing the Puritans, nor the purposes represented by these structures, he would be impressed at first by something outer and obvious: a distinctive style of architecture. Looking back through history he would realize that the inspiration of this architecture was Greek, and that Greek halls of philosophy and even the Parthenon had furnished the models for this architectural development. He would be amazed to find evidence that the highest reaches of Greek culture had manifested themselves anew in the austere and pioneer life of the people who were subduing the New England wilderness. He would be puzzled by this startling development, and he would question whether there was anything in Puritanism or in the life of the Puritans in New England to justify this rebirth of Greek architecture.

If he went into these buildings, typical of a New England village, he would find in the school a great educational movement going forward, a movement which aimed at the educa-

tion of the entire population, a movement which had as its ideal that there should be no illiteracy whatsoever in the community. The Puritans started a movement for education as soon as they arrived in New England, and it is significant that several towns claim the great honor of having been the site of the first public school. Within twenty years the public-school system was well developed throughout the commonwealth. The ideal expressed in this system is significant: to promote the welfare of the whole community by raising the level of intelligence of the entire population. This system provided for primary and grammar schools according to the number of families in each town; and these schools pointed toward the Puritan college in Cambridge.

If our imaginary visitor, studying a typical New England village, went into the town house, he would discover that an effective form of democracy had created another significant institution. In earlier centuries men had experimented with the idea of putting government into the hands of the common people. To be capable of self-government, men need enlightened minds and well-balanced judg-

ment. Many of these early experiments failed because of the lack of general education; but in a typical New England village, as Puritan life developed, the men of the village who gathered in *town meeting* had all been educated in the *public school.* Here was an enormous advance in the application of the spirit of democracy. To educate first those who were to be the future voters meant that matured powers and enlightened minds and disciplined wills were enlisted in the work of promoting the public welfare; and in the town meeting the citizens were adding to their wisdom as they grew in experience.

This imaginary visitor would necessarily be impressed by the vitality of debates and by the directness of action of a town meeting. He would be impressed, also, by the action of the citizens of a town as they chose the men who should go as their representatives to participate in the central government of the commonwealth. To that higher assembly these chosen men carried the discipline they had received in the public school and the rich experience they had gained in the town meeting. Here were the institutions which nourished the principles of

democracy and which trained the men who held in their hands the final authority in the government of the commonwealth.

Let us, however, follow our imaginary visitor as he makes a study of the most imposing of the group of structures facing the village green, the typical New England meetinghouse. The Grecian columns and pilasters which distinguish the front of the building are surmounted by a superstructure of rare grace and strength and beauty — the tower and spire. The interior of the church is well adapted to its purpose. It has a prominent pulpit which gives to a scholarly minister the opportunity to be heard distinctly by every person in the congregation. The form of the building and its seating arrangement, including spacious galleries, are so planned that the maximum number of people may hear the man in the pulpit. Ceremonies are minimized, and preaching is magnified, by the interior arrangement of such a church.

These three buildings, facing the village green, differ in their uses. A session of the village school, a meeting of the voters of the town, and a Sunday morning service in the church

are unlike. Yet these three institutions, the school, the town house and the church, are not three distinct things but three expressions of one faith: the faith in the powers of human personality, its possibility for development, its power of self-government, and its capacity for vital relationship with the Almighty. An ideal of manhood inspires all three of these institutions.

Questions which have puzzled our imaginary visitor are still waiting for our answer. Why has Greek culture leaped across twenty centuries and across five thousand miles of land and sea, to appear again on these rugged New England hillsides? Why has classic beauty, which was the product of centuries of intellectual life, planted itself in a frontier life, in a region from which wild beasts and red savages were being driven back but slowly by intrepid pioneers? Is there not something incongruous in using the architecture of a Greek hall of philosophy or of a Greek temple, for the central buildings of a New England village?

When we find the answer to this problem we shall find that this typical New England architecture has done the most appropriate

thing possible in going to Greece for its models. The key to the situation is found by going back to about the year fifteen hundred, and to a cultural movement which created the spirit of modern life. The personality most significant for our interpretation is Erasmus, a great leader of the Renaissance. He was one of the leading exponents of the noble humanism which gave quality to the Renaissance, an era when culture was reborn.

It is not necessary to pause here to tell the whole story of that transition from mediævalism to humanism which terminated one distinctive era of European life and ushered in our modern era. But we do need to understand the greatly changed attitude of men of the new spirit toward *human values*. For many centuries western Europe had been dominated by Catholic orthodoxy. Vast institutions had been built up, beneath which men were crushed. Institutions were primary; human values were secondary. Men had forgotten what Jesus said concerning the institution of the Sabbath, " The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath." The new humanistic movement exalted man as being

precious in the sight of God. It could have adapted the words of Jesus, condensing its essential principle into this one great sentence, "Institutions are made for man, not man for institutions." It brought about a revolution in human thinking by placing human values uppermost, linking them to God; and by judging all things by their results in promoting human welfare.

In the midst of the new development of culture and the new emphasis upon human values, Erasmus did a piece of work which gave to the world a dynamic book. For a thousand years the Bible had been known to the scholars of Europe principally in the Latin version of the Church of Rome, a stately, ponderous and venerable version. Erasmus was thrilled by the rediscovery of the Greek New Testament which was vital, animated, direct and inspiring. One of his greatest achievements was the use that he made of the recently invented printing press to publish this newly discovered book. Not only did he print the Greek New Testament, but he put with it his own flexible and enlightening translation in Latin which made it accessible to thousands of European

scholars; for Latin was the principal international language. He also published a paraphrase of the New Testament which put its great utterances into what was then modern form. In the years that followed, not only England but every other European country was shaken to its very foundations by the influence of the Bible.

This influence, however, was destined to reach much wider circles. Let us recall that at that time the Bible known generally in Western Europe was the Latin edition of the Roman Church, the Vulgate; and that in its choice of words it sustained the doctrines of that church. The Greek New Testament was, to those who could read it, like a fresh clear stream from the mountains, flowing into the level plain. It stirred men by its startling way of presenting narratives and ideas already familiar. It led men to the rethinking of spiritual truth and to vital conclusions, at variance from orthodox standards. Men had been accustomed to read the Bible in the Vulgate and in the light of the Church's enforced interpretation. Erasmus encouraged men to read the New Testament, giving to the words the meaning which in-

telligence and scholarship recognized. The Bible was thus a transformed book with new meanings.

Erasmus, however, dreamed a greater dream than even this stimulating work, for he hoped that the Bible might be translated into the languages of the common people of many lands. He said: "I wish that even the weakest woman might read the Gospels and the Epistles of St. Paul. I wish that they were translated into all languages, so as to be read and understood not only by Scots and Irishmen, but even by Saracens and Turks. But the first step to their being read is to make them intelligible to the reader. I long for the day when the husbandman shall sing portions of them to himself as he follows the plow, when the weaver shall hum them to the tune of his shuttle, when the traveler shall wile away with their stories the weariness of his journey."

Men found the Greek New Testament of Erasmus so vital, so flexible, so dynamic, that they were inspired to undertake the task of translating it into the languages of many nations. This was the book that gave Tyndale the heroic task which led to his martyrdom in

the flames. It was Tyndale's translation of Erasmus' Greek New Testament that gave to English Puritanism a new and mighty implement.

From the time when men formed themselves into a secret order to smuggle the printed copies of Tyndale's New Testament into England, the mediævalism of that country was doomed, and the Renaissance was assured of a great influence there. The later development of Puritanism in England and America was associated vitally with that Book, which made Greek influence live again in western lands and modern times.

We come to the time of the highest tide of the influence of Puritanism when we consider the years from 1630 to 1700, both in England and in New England. The Puritans were carrying on, through long years, the process of interpreting the Bible and applying its teachings to every phase of their life. In England Puritanism gained political power under Cromwell, and though the experiment of the English commonwealth failed outwardly, the spiritual influence of Puritanism continued.

In the year 1666 came the great fire of Lon-

don, and this was just when Christopher Wren was at the beginning of his brilliant career as an architect. England was in a ferment of debate. Men were questioning the very foundations of government. They were searching for the ultimate sources of political authority. They were rejudging human values. They were discussing religion intensely. They were searching the Bible with the minutest care, because of their conviction that the will of God was revealed in it.

The great fire of London destroyed fifty churches, and Christopher Wren was called upon to plan the churches which should rise out of the ashes. He did a revolutionary thing. In a church in which the principal act is the miracle of the Mass, there is no emphasis upon the idea that the worshiper should *understand* what is being done; enough for him that he be *present* and that he meekly and humbly receive the supernatural benefits of that miracle. For centuries the supreme architectural achievement of Christianity had been the Gothic cathedral. It was a place in which to *see* rather than a place in which to *hear*. It was a place which appealed to the emotions and the im-

agination of one who witnessed the miracle of the Mass, rather than a place in which there was any appeal to man's reason or to any other phase of his intellect.

The greatest need of this era, in which occurred the great fire of London, was a new type of church architecture, adapted to a generation of men who were debating religion, listening to preachers, and seeking to approach religion with *understanding*. That great need was met by the supreme genius and spiritual insight of one of the most famous architects of all time. Christopher Wren saw that the need of the time would be met by building churches as places in which to *hear* instead of merely in which to *see*.

Wren was born two years after the sailing of John Winthrop in the *Arbella,* with the charter on which the Puritans built up the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He grew up during the stirring years of the bitter contest between Charles I and the parliamentary party. He was a student in Oxford University when Charles I was beheaded. Ten years after graduation, Wren became a professor of astronomy in Oxford. He became more and

more interested in architecture; and, after the restoration of the Stuart royal line to the throne of England, Charles II asked Wren to prepare plans for the repairing of old St. Paul's Cathedral. Wren wrote that, in remodeling it, he did not want "to follow the Gothic rudeness of the old design."

While his mind was busy on this problem came the great fire of London, and this made necessary the complete rebuilding of St.Paul's. Under the choir of it Wren was buried in 1723, and he is commemorated in the famous sentence written in Latin, "If you would see my monument, look around you."

The real monuments of Sir Christopher Wren are many, and they surpass, in significance, even the magnificent cathedral which shelters his grave. He built fifty London churches, — a magnificent architectural achievement. In doing this work he was the real creator of a distinctive type of church architecture, which has been further glorified in the New England meetinghouse.

His creation of a new type of architecture is his greatest distinction. He made a radical change in the general form and the proportions

of his most typical churches. He made less emphatic the chancel with its *sacrament* and more emphatic the pulpit with its *sermon.* He so planned these churches as to bring the maximum number of people within hearing of the man in the pulpit. He emphasized the *understanding* of religion more than its *emotional* appeal. He had the profound insight to sense the spirit of the time, and he revealed the creative genius that housed that spirit in churches perfectly adapted to it.

This demand for the intelligent approach to religion came of the influence of the Greek New Testament of Erasmus. Had it not been for the work of Erasmus, the great humanist, who led a movement for a return to the Greek classics, the great architect Sir Christopher Wren would not have had so significant an opportunity.

This architectural movement, at the head of which stands Wren, recognized the profound fact that it was appropriate to go to Greek architectural models for churches which were to house a religious movement derived from a dynamic Greek book. Wren was in the direct line of succession from Erasmus.

An emotional religion may properly house itself in churches which are lavishly decorated and may appropriately invite men to witness a ceremonial rich in color and movement. A religion which makes austere demands on man's reason and understanding should be sparing of ornament in its churches. The chaste beauty of a Greek hall of philosophy offers this greater simplicity. Wren and his followers have found in Greek models the needed inspiration for their work.

Wren had a very practical reason, too, for being sparing of ornament, and this was the poverty resulting from the great fire of London. But he changed harsh necessity into wondrous opportunity. In those churches which are most characteristic of his work, the exterior may be very plain and barren, and yet the whole stucture may be glorified by some one feature of indescribable beauty. Absolutely plain walls may be surmounted by a tower and spire so perfect in form and design that the slightest alteration would lessen the beauty of the whole. He shows, indeed, in his designs, an amazing genius for exquisitely beautiful church spires.

While Wren was working in England, his influence spread to America. During all these decades from 1630 onward, the Puritans of New England were by no means detached from the Puritans of the mother country. Many ships moved back and forth like shuttles between the two countries, weaving a web of influence. Puritan publications produced in either country were circulated in both. There was remarkable community of thought and feeling. Men who had settled in Puritan New England returned to the mother land to share in the war under Cromwell. New England gave shelter to some of the judges who had condemned Charles I to death, but who had to flee for their lives when, in the Restoration, Charles II came to the throne of England. Because of this constant interplay of influences between England and New England the work of Christopher Wren had an immediate influence in New England. Copies of his drawings were brought across the ocean, and skilful architects and builders reproduced here the great works of his creative genius. Puritanism thus developed the New England meeting-house. It adopted much of Christopher

Wren's work, and modified it by new and original influences.

This is why the New England meetinghouse is essentially a place in which to *hear* instead of a place in which merely to *see*. It exalts the pulpit which it provides for a scholarly minister. This is why it uses so greatly the rectangular form, and by the addition of spacious galleries, brings the maximum number of people within hearing of the man who stands in the pulpit. Recall the text, " Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind," for it is expressive of the very genius of the religion of Puritanism. The man in the pulpit does not assert the authority of a priest. He makes no claim to possessing a monopoly of the means of grace. He asks no man to believe simply because the pulpit makes its declaration. He does not aim at uniformity of belief. He does not expect men to bow their consciences and their reason before an autocratic authority. He asserts, on behalf of his hearers, the right of " private judgment." He wants men to *believe,* but he wants them also to know *why* they believe. He encourages men in making their own interpretations of the Bible. He does his

best work where the Puritan ideals of enlightenment and originality have been most fully developed.

The New England meetinghouse has its proper place in close association with the school and the town house. The same men who, on the Sabbath, have been encouraged to think for themselves in matters of eternal significance, assemble in the town house and debate those questions of public policy which concern their welfare in all its phases. The same democracy which is expressed in the meetinghouse is expressed in the town house. The same sturdy self-reliance, and the same originality of thought and action are stimulated and developed.

In the adjoining school is carried on that process of education which is to result in men being capable of fulfilling the ideals of the meetinghouse and the town house. The typical New England school makes no distinction between rich and poor, and has no regard for those accidental differences which come from the chance circumstances of life. It goes to the very center of human personality and says, "Here are latent powers which are to be de-

veloped. These powers are to be developed not primarily for any commercial gain, but because they are divine in origin and most surely fulfil the eternal purpose, if they are developed to the utmost."

Return, now, to the thought of Erasmus and his publication of the Greek New Testament. Men had the insight to see that the culture of the Puritans had flowed from the discovery of the Greek New Testament, just as a stream flows from a spring among the hills; and so they must look to Greek life and Greek thought as the source of that inspiration. Thus a highway of influence was established from ancient Greece to the work of Erasmus, from Erasmus to the Puritans, and from the Puritans to their creative work in New England life.

As has been pointed out, Christopher Wren, and architects who followed in his footsteps, saw that the religious and intellectual and educational life of Puritanism should be housed in buildings which owed the inspiration of their architecture to Greek models. Men who saw that the typical life of New England could be traced through the Greek New Testament asked what style of building was most

appropriate for New England meetinghouses, town houses, and schools. With supreme appropriateness they found that answer in going to the Greek halls of philosophy and to the Parthenon and copying the forms and proportions of those buildings, reproducing the exquisite stately beauty of ancient columns and pilasters. They measured again the cornices and the angles of the roofs of Greek buildings and repeated them in these new structures. Thus there was a rebirth on New England hillsides of the very highest achievements of Greek genius and inspiration.

This highway of influence from Greece to New England left Rome upon a by-path. This meant much, for it meant that the Roman conceptions of religion and of government were set aside. New England Puritanism would have nothing to do with the Roman autocracy, or its assertion of the *institution* above the worth of *personality*. Puritans swept aside the theory of the Roman Mass, with its miracle of the sacrament. They rejected utterly the Roman theory of a priesthood possessing miraculous powers. New England Puritanism became a magnificent expression of the

very finest phases of humanism, in that it asserted the greatness of man derived from the supreme greatness of God. It sought to know the will of God in order that man might find his own highest meaning in the fulfilment of that supreme will. It asserted the sovereignty of God; but instead of deriving, from that, the doctrine of the insignificance of man, it derived from it the doctrine of man's supreme importance as the agent by which the eternal will was to be expressed. New England Calvinism became intensely republican in its outlook. In some other countries Calvinism had a tendency, among a few people, to become fatalistic, and to lead those people to the attitude of meek resignation to the eternal decrees. The New England Puritan made his typical application of Calvinism in his declaration that, since men are the agents of the divine will, they have a dignity and an authority which is above that of kings. From the very beginnings of the Puritan settlements of New England, there was a startling assertion of a spirit of independence. Massachusetts never was docile in the presence of the assertion of royal power. In the first decade of

Puritan life in Massachusetts, the king of England detected this spirit of independence and originality on the part of men in the colony; and this was why he arrogantly demanded the return of the royal charter of Massachusetts. The reply of Massachusetts was made by fortifying Boston Harbor and secreting the charter, thus revealing more clearly her spirit of independence. In the first few years of the life of the new colony, men began to speak of Massachusetts as a " Commonwealth " and to discontinue the use of the word " Colony " and this emphasized self-government instead of dependence on the mother country.

This spirit of independence, which expressed itself in colonial legislation, was nourished by the colonial churches and the public schools. In the course of time the central green in many a New England village became the training ground for men who were preparing to resist, by force of arms if need be, the autocratic claims of the king of England. These men felt that their use of the village green was quite as sacred as their use of the buildings which faced upon it. They had been educated together, as lads, in the public school. They had learned a re-

ligion of democratic principles in their white meetinghouse. They had been trained in democratic government in a simple school of experience in their town house. The principles which they had learned in these three institutions, typical of a New England village, gave them a vital faith which they were willing to defend with "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor."

Chapter IX

DYNAMIC IDEALS

The relationship between Greek culture and New England Puritanism was, as we have seen, vital. As pictured in the preceding chapter, the typical New England village was a new incarnation of that spirit of culture. Puritans might fall short of their ideals, but still we must know what those ideals were if we are to understand Puritanism. Individuals deviated widely from the Puritan type, and yet they are to be interpreted in the light of our knowledge of what that type really was. There were times when the conduct of Puritans ran to excess, but we need to know what their normal life was in order to evaluate even the eccentricities of their occasional abnormal behavior.

Greek culture emphasized normal human reason, and applied this faculty to knowledge and to life. As all normal men have a measure of reason, the emphasis placed on the guidance

of that faculty tends toward breadth of mind. In New England, the Puritan clergy had a good deal of power, politically and socially as well as religiously. Yet the clergy were not regarded as a priestly class. This truth needs to be emphasized greatly. Their ministry was essentially educational. They claimed no possession of a special avenue of approach to truth or to God. They used their reason and encouraged their parishioners to exercise, with great freedom, the same faculty. The Puritan preacher was usually the best educated man in his community, and was likely to be able to read his Bible in the original Hebrew and Greek. In expounding Scripture to his people, he spoke from higher knowledge but not in a superior tone. He asked no man to believe him simply on the ground of his being the minister of the church. The Bible was analyzed by preacher and parishioners in the light of reason, which was the possession of all. The aversion which Puritans felt for those who claimed personal and private communications from God accounts for their unwillingness to tolerate long such persons as Anne Hutchinson.

The Puritans who came to New England

in the great migration had been well indoctrinated in Calvin's system of interpretation of the Bible. But they developed quickly a sympathetic attitude toward the principle of John Robinson, Pilgrim pastor in Leyden, that " the Lord hath more truth and light yet to break forth out of his Holy Word." They looked askance, however, at eccentric individuals who claimed private illumination from deity; and they adhered strongly to the principle that the new " truth and light " would come as the possession of all, and by the use of the power of reason which was exercised by all. They were *socially* minded and were determined to travel in *company* as they followed the path of progress.

In the early years of Puritan life in New England, the idea prevailed that, as the study of the Bible was carried forward, it would tend more and more to *unanimity*. Surely the truth of God must become more and more clear, and finally be so reasonable, so convincing, that all rational people would accept it. They did not at first make allowance for the tendencies toward ever greater variety in Biblical interpretations, nor did they see at first how they

could make their plan of life sufficiently flexible to accommodate in their community, on equal terms, men whose convictions were diametrically opposite.

Step by step, however, *events* forced the Puritan mind to adapt itself to the thought of an increasing variety in convictions, both theological and political. The time had to come when men would coöperate for the attainment of high aims, even though they differed widely in opinions which they regarded as vital.

In the early decades of life in Massachusetts, let us remember, church membership and citizenship were linked together. The men who were to vote in a political meeting were the men who had received communion in the church. Every minister who received a man into church membership opened to him the gate into citizenship in the Commonwealth. Though church covenants were flexible and permitted much latitude in theology, the ministers were well aware of the responsibility of guarding the conditions of the suffrage. Hence it was reasonable to regard church membership as a prize, not to be awarded on terms too easy.

At this point, however, came one of the

forces which made it necessary for the Puritan mind to adapt itself to the idea of variety instead of uniformity. Thomas Hooker, migrating from Massachusetts, did not carry with him the idea of requiring voters to be church members. In Connecticut, the colony which he created, there was no such requirement. Puritanism was expressing itself in a new way, and the Puritan mind was adapting itself to the idea of variety instead of uniformity.

Meantime another Puritan colony was formed which also differed from Massachusetts. This colony was New Haven, and its founder was John Davenport. He regarded Massachusetts as too liberal, instead of taking Hooker's view that it was too restrictive in its law on suffrage. John Davenport had been an Anglican clergyman in a large church in London, England. As a Puritan, he came under Archbishop Laud's sinister attention; and he fled to Amsterdam, where he ministered to a congregation of refugees. A correspondence with John Cotton led Davenport to come to Boston with two shiploads of Puritans in the autumn of 1637. He came into the center of the storm raging at that time over Anne

Hutchinson, and the anxiety over the war with the Pequot tribe of Indians. He interviewed Anne Hutchinson in John Cotton's house. In a few months he had made a study of the whole situation, and had resolved to go where he could organize a colony of his own, with strict regulations based very exactly on his interpretation of the Bible. He found the place which suited him on Long Island Sound, westward of the mouth of the Connecticut River. Here again was Puritanism adding variety to its expressions, not only in its interpretation of the Bible but in its application of that dynamic book to the creation of self-governing colonies.

It is highly significant that, within a decade of the founding of Boston, the spirit of Puritanism was not tending toward fixed uniformity but was looking out on a group of colonies of its own creation, and was forced to admit that variety, not uniformity, was to be expected. Also it was perfectly evident that this variety was not merely temporary; for there was no evidence that these colonies tended to grow more alike.

Another force became operative at this point: the necessity for united action for the

defense of all the colonies. Much of the soil of New England, as the settlers discovered, was unpromising, and they searched far and wide for fertile areas. Hence the colonies were scattered, and there was a large Indian population interspersed among them. A pestilence had killed a large number of the Indians just before the coming of the English settlers to New England, and the savages regarded the first of these white men with superstitious awe. But as a new generation of Indians was growing up, they gained in numbers, and their normal state of mind returned. Therefore it became evident to the citizens of the colonies that they must combine their strength if they were to gain the mastery over the savages. The idea of forming a federation of the New England colonies is highly significant in two ways: it tended to impress upon the Puritan mind the idea of tolerating a variety of opinions while attaining a united purpose; and also it *pointed* toward the final federation of all the English-speaking colonies, in America, in the federal form of government of the American Republic, though that was achieved only in the following century.

Just as the plan was being worked out for "The United Colonies of New England," Massachusetts took a significant step in the direction of the principle of variety in unity. In the years 1641 to 1643 four towns near the mouth of the Piscataqua River were annexed to Massachusetts, though these were afterwards part of New Hampshire. Two of these towns had been founded by men of the Church of England and two by men from Massachusetts. One of these men was John Wheelwright, brother-in-law of Anne Hutchinson. Massachusetts wanted the additional territory but had to relax the custom of demanding fellowship in her system of Puritan churches. Here was another *political event* which liberalized the Puritan *religious ideas.*

In 1643, when four Puritan commonwealths organized "The United Colonies of New England," their total population was twenty-four thousand people in about forty towns. These four commonwealths were Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Haven, and Plymouth. The last is properly classed as a "Puritan" commonwealth, for, though it had modified Puritan principles by applying Pilgrim ideals,

it was increasingly in sympathy with the Massachusetts type of Puritanism. Each modified the other.

In this federation, the United Colonies, Rhode Island was not included. That colony received a charter in 1644 and applied for membership in the United Colonies the same year. The application was renewed four years later, but both times it was refused on the ground that the government of Rhode Island was unstable.

As the United Colonies had formed their federation partly to subdue the Indians, Roger Williams might prove a weakness instead of a strength, because of his ideas of Indian rights. Then, too, Rhode Island was a haven of refuge for a great variety of religious opinions. Few communities in the world, at that time, offered shelter to so many creeds and received them with such broad toleration. Roger Williams found himself in much turmoil over the variety of *moral* standards and *political* theories which he had to shelter. He himself was rebaptized, on the ground that his Puritan baptism was insufficient; and then he repudiated his new baptism. But in later years he developed

greater stability in his religious ideas and proved himself a real statesman.

At the time, however, when men were shaping the plan for the United Colonies, Rhode Island was looked upon with great caution, even suspicion. There are critics of the Puritans who assert that Massachusetts was more to blame than Rhode Island, and who praise the tolerant spirit of the Pilgrims of Plymouth. But Elder William Brewster of Plymouth wrote in 1642, " Concerning the Islanders, we have no conversing with them, nor desire to have, further than necessity or humanity may require." Roger Williams and Anne Hutchinson had created disturbances in Massachusetts by making *political* application of their personal *religious* views; and these ardent advocates of personal liberty found it necessary to cause to be enacted, in Rhode Island, the same kind of law as that under which they had suffered in Massachusetts. In the settlement founded by Anne Hutchinson and her company of people, the Constable was charged " to see that the peace be kept, and that there be no unlawful *meetings,* or anything that may tend to *civil* disturbance prac-

tised." This is highly significant; for it shows that when people become responsible for the stability of a *community,* they are likely to be willing to set a limit on the expression of *individual* opinion. There was the recognition of the principle that the State had a right to maintain its own existence.

Though during his years of activity in Plymouth and Massachusetts, Roger Williams had caused much trouble by his eccentric ideas and his manner of expressing them, and though in his first years in Rhode Island he made radical revisions of his own religious views, he is entitled to great credit for what he achieved in later years when his judgment was sobered by governmental responsibilities. Though his neighbors in the other colonies looked askance at Rhode Island, as being a refuge for erratic people, Roger Williams did organize these people into a permanent self-governing body. Though few communities in the world, in that age, would have ventured to grant religious liberty to their own people, Roger Williams had the courage of his convictions in this matter, took the hazard, endured the consequent turmoil, and anticipated the modern

American ideal of religious freedom for all men. He had enough of the shrewdness and grace of a diplomat to go to England and obtain, in 1644, a charter for his colony. He was its governor through many stormy years, and, by his real statesmanship, he left an indelible mark, not only upon the colony of his own creation but upon American life.

It may be that it was the Rhode Island tradition of prolonged debate which caused that State to be the last one, of the original thirteen, to ratify the Constitution of the United States. But surely the principle of religious freedom, incarnated in Rhode Island, had its influence in putting into the first amendment to our constitution the provision that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This was a reversal of the custom of Massachusetts but an assertion of the ideal of Rhode Island. Roger Williams was not a typical Puritan; that is, he did not represent the average opinion nor voice the will of the majority. But inherent in Puritanism was the principle that every man had a right to interpret the Bible for himself. Roger

Williams was of a sufficiently daring spirit to make that ideal one of the cardinal principles of his colony. He wanted to see how it would work. In his pragmatic test he was doing what other Puritans were doing with other ideals in other colonies. This is one more example of the truth that Puritan ideals were dynamic; that they had expansive power which impelled these people to move forward in untried ways and to diverge into ever broadening areas of thought and action. There was, too, a notable flexibility in Puritan principles which made it possible to adapt them to constantly changing conditions; and the Puritans did great creative work in times of vast political confusion, for they brought order out of chaos, not by reducing life to rigid rules but by giving it a means of orderly expression and the opportunity for growth.

An example of another principle which was certain to expand itself in additional legislation is found in Massachusetts. Though the suffrage was closely guarded, and men must be church members to have the full power of Freemen in the Colony, we find this very interesting enactment in the Body of Liberties:

" Every man, whether inhabitant or foreigner, free or not free, shall have liberty to come to any court, council, or town meeting, and either by speech or writing to move any lawful, seasonable, and material question, or to present any necessary motion, complaint, petition, bill, or information." Massachusetts was much larger than the other colonies, in its first decades, and had much at stake. While careful not to allow the enemies of Puritanism to gain the power of overturning the government, there was a large measure of liberty for the expression of opinion and the influencing of legislation, as is shown by this enactment in early years.

Reference has been made already to the organization of " The United Colonies of New England " as an example of the growing willingness to admit variety of opinions while gaining unity of purpose. That organization was strong and vigorous through the time of the Long Parliament in England and Cromwell's Commonwealth, and into the first years of the reign of Charles II. This period of its greatest strength was about twenty years, extending from its organization until 1664. It

continued, though with somewhat diminished power, for another twenty years and enabled the colonies to use their united military strength against the Indians during the terrible years of "King Philip's War." The result of that war was that the red men were no longer a menace to the whites, though the latter suffered fearfully in this decisive contest. Of the ninety towns of the settlers, twelve were wiped out; and of the settlers, a thousand men, besides many women and children, lost their lives.

We shall see, in the further course of our narrative, why the actual organization of "The United Colonies of New England" was dissolved; but the coöperative spirit of these commonwealths, created by Puritanism, lived on, achieving notable political results and preparing New England to take a leading part in the war for American Independence. During its active years, the board of Commissioners of the United Colonies promoted very important measures including diplomatic negotiations with England. The governmental activity in promoting internal welfare and coöperation, carrying on foreign diplomacy, and conducting

successful war against the nearest enemy, was valuable experience; and it promoted a sense of nationality which was not fully realized till these United Colonies were sovereign states in a new self-governing nation.

Chapter X

CREATING A NEW NATION

The Puritan migration to New England covers approximately the decade during which King Charles I endeavored to rule England without Parliament. Though he made a serious threat to interfere with Massachusetts, he had so much in England to occupy his mind that he interfered but little in New England; and the new colonies, so far as internal affairs were concerned, governed themselves almost like independent commonwealths. Then came the era of the Long Parliament and of Cromwell's Commonwealth, when the English government was friendly to the Puritans at home and in America. The English policy of non-interference permitted "The United Colonies of New England" to act almost like a republic. But a new era begins about 1660 because of the return of the Stuart line of kings to the English throne. This era ended when the Eng-

lish people finally drove out the Stuart dynasty and would endure them no longer.

One of the conditions on which Charles II was allowed to return to the throne of England was that he agree to an act of immunity for political offenses committed between 1637 and 1660, which prevented the wholesale execution of men who had shared in the downfall of Charles I and the promotion of the Commonwealth. Only the "regicides" were not included in this act of immunity. This was a term applied to the group of judges who had sat on the bench at the trial of Charles I and had sentenced him to death. Two of these judges escaped to New England and were sheltered by Puritans. They were hidden for a time in the home of John Davenport, the Puritan pastor of New Haven. He even preached a sermon on their behalf.

Early in the reign of Charles II, when John Winthrop, Governor of Connecticut, (son of the first governor of Massachusetts) went to England petitioning for a charter for his colony, he obtained larger concessions than he asked. Why was any favor shown to a Puritan colony? Not that the king loved Con-

necticut more, but loved New Haven less. Without previous notice the latter colony was obliterated. The charter of Connecticut designated its northern boundary as the Massachusetts line, and its southern boundary as Long Island Sound. On the east, Connecticut began at Narragansett Bay, and it extended westward to the Pacific Ocean. No one knew the width of the American continent.

Connecticut did not limit the suffrage to Puritans, while New Haven was more rigid in this matter than Massachusetts. Therefore King Charles II could extend the area where Anglicans could vote by widening the boundaries of Connecticut and allowing that colony to swallow completely its neighbor. Besides this, even while the charter of Connecticut was being written, New Haven was sheltering the " regicides "; and the king had his revenge by destroying the government of that colony. This was not, however, a mark of royal leniency to the colony of Connecticut. The ultimate destruction of the Puritan colonies was the purpose of Charles II; and though death took the king in 1685, his brother James II attempted to complete what Charles had left un-

done. James had but a brief and tumultuous reign before he was driven out of England in 1688.

Charles II, believing that his restoration to the throne meant that the English people would submit to autocratic rule, attempted late in his reign to govern without Parliament. The cities and towns of England were strongholds of Puritanism; but Charles took away the charter of London, and then the charters of many other towns. In 1684 he flatly refused to summon Parliament. He then proceeded toward the accomplishment of his plan to destroy the Puritan colonies. Massachusetts was given the option of modifying her Puritan laws or surrendering her charter. In the third Puritan Church in Boston, the predecessor of the one now called affectionately "The Old South Meetinghouse," which stands on the same site, a great town meeting was held. Not a voice was raised in favor of submitting to the royal tyranny, and not a hand was lifted when the moderator called for a vote by all who would surrender the charter. The news of this meeting reached the king; and the royal resentment was expressed in the edict by

which the charter of Massachusetts was declared void on June 21, 1684. The Puritans had a proud record of achievement during the fifty-five years during which they had cherished the charter and had built upon it. Every Puritan's ownership of his land and home was based on that charter; and the king intended, by destroying the charter, to put these people into the position of trespassers.

Just at this ominous crisis came the death of Charles II by a stroke of apoplexy, and the accession of James II. The new king sent over Sir Edmund Andros as royal governor with instructions to unite the Puritan colonies into one royal province. Andros had bitter prejudices against the Puritans, and had an arrogant will. He was of just the spirit to act the part of a royal despot. In 1687 he visited Hartford, the capital of Connecticut. At an evening conference with the governor and a large company of intensely excited citizens, Andros demanded that the colonial governor, Robert Treat, hand over the charter of Connecticut for destruction. A few men formed a daring plan, moved to positions near the candles by which the room was lighted, and, at

a given signal, quenched their flames. In one instant the room was plunged into deep darkness. Before flint and steel could restore the lights, the charter was spirited away and hidden in the hollow heart of the famous "Charter Oak." In more peaceful times it was brought from its hiding place and continued in force, with very slight modification, till long after the time when Connecticut became a sovereign state in the American Republic. Until 1818 the charter of Connecticut was continued, and that of Rhode Island until 1842. These facts suggest how nearly the Puritan colonies had come to the status of self-governing commonwealths.

New York and New Jersey were added to the royal province under the despotic rule of Andros, who chose Boston as his capital. He saw clearly that Boston was the fountain head of the spirit of New England Puritanism and that Puritanism was the equivalent of the spirit of political self-government; therefore it was the opposite of all that Andros represented. The royal governor wanted, by his personal presence and by a display of his most arbitrary acts, to humiliate the town which expressed

most intensely the principles of Puritanism. He demanded one of the Puritan churches as a place in which the ritual of the Church of England would be used on Sunday mornings; but the Puritan ministers were the leaders of the opposition to political tyranny, and they refused the demand. The "Old South" had been the place of the town meeting in which no hand had been lifted and no voice raised in favor of surrendering the charter. Andros therefore chose to humiliate the "Old South" by seizing it and holding there the services of the Church of England.

If the royal governor could have carried out his despotic plans, he would have forced the Anglican ritual on the Puritan churches and have destroyed Harvard College which, like Cambridge University in England, was a hotbed of Puritan ideals. He seized a part of one of the burial grounds in Boston and ordered the erection of the first King's Chapel. The present building, at the corner of Tremont and School Streets, stands on the same site and perpetuates the name. But the royal governor was not destined to share in the dedication of King's Chapel.

Andros abolished the General Court of Massachusetts and took from the town meetings the control of taxation. In short, he sought to destroy the liberties which had been the English tradition for centuries and which Puritanism had expanded. It was said that "the people of New England had now no further privileges left than not to be sold into slavery." John Wise, the Puritan pastor of Ipswich, whose writings anticipated the American Revolution, protested against these despotic acts and was thrown into prison.

Puritanism was supplying the religious fervor which was impelling men toward the assertion of their political rights; and events were moving rapidly toward a crisis, when Boston received startling news. On April 4, 1689, a ship sailed into the harbor and, hardly waiting for her to anchor, a messenger came ashore declaring that the English patriots had driven out James II and that, by their invitation, William of Orange had landed in England to become king. Would the attempted revolution in England succeed? Men waited tensely for two weeks, but on Beacon Hill the preparations were made for the kindling of a

signal fire, and men were on guard day and night, to be ready thus to flash the news to watchers on other hilltops. Messengers carried this first news to other towns and people watched eagerly for the blazing signal. In two weeks came the welcome message that the success of the revolution was assured. Immediately there was an armed revolt against the tyrannical Andros. Troops poured into Boston from the surrounding towns. Disguised as a woman, Andros attempted to escape, but was seized and thrown into prison. The revolution in Massachusetts was complete. Amid great rejoicing, Boston acclaimed King William and Queen Mary. A few weeks later Andros was taken from prison and, closely guarded, was put on a ship and deported to England, charged with having conspired against the righteous liberties of the people. He was not, however, brought to trial.

It is notable that, without waiting for royal authority, the people of the Puritan colonies created anew their own governments. In England the will of Parliament was supreme, and no English sovereign since James II has dared to defy the power of the House of Commons.

Puritanism in the mother country, though it had been forced outside the established church, had vindicated itself politically; and its defense of parliamentary government had assured a complete victory for essential democracy.

In 1692 Massachusetts obtained a new charter which differed greatly from the old one. The governor was not elected by the people but was appointed by the king. The suffrage was broadened; and men who belonged to the Church of England, as well as the men of other forms of faith, were not debarred from full citizenship. The theocratic type of government came to an end. Plymouth was annexed to Massachusetts and thus the Pilgrim colony ceased its separate existence. Massachusetts entered on an era marked by petty irritations, as a succession of royal governors endeavored to check the spirit of self-government. But the General Court and the town meetings resumed the control of legislation and taxation. Shrewd ways were found to attain the desires of the people; and the time did not come when the people submitted meekly to the royal will.

It is commonly asserted that, with the coming of the new charter of Massachusetts, the

power of Puritanism ended and the Puritan plan of government proved itself to be a failure. This is a very superficial judgment, which comes of looking at the form and not at the spirit. A simple illustration will serve our purpose at this point.

Imagine a man who knows little about birds, and who is walking in the woods in the late summer. Upon the ground he finds what had been a bird's nest and, near it, bits of colored, brittle, broken shell. He knows nothing about the kind of bird that was hatched from this shell. The color of the shell gives him no hint of the plumage of the bird. The brittleness of the shell conveys no suggestion of the flexibility and the power of the wings of the living creature that was incubated within it. The limitations of the nest are not prophetic of the wide range of the migrations of this wondrous winged creature that has gone forth into freedom from this limited life. But the bird had to have its period of incubation *within the shell.*

Compare this simple picture with New England Puritanism. The Puritans in Massachusetts did defend themselves, for a time, with strict laws. But let us not identify the living

spirit of Puritanism with its temporary expression in any period. The Puritans made a great experiment with the ideal of the powers of human personality. Those expanding powers could not have been kept indefinitely within the protecting shell of any one code of laws. The New England town meeting was an *institution* which expressed and nourished a living *spirit* of political democracy. The method is not to be identified with the spirit. Any of the institutions of Puritanism could be modified, even as the Puritans of later years changed the cut of their coats; but the emphasis which Puritanism put on the powers of human personality expressed an abiding faith. Puritan codes of laws were superseded, but the Puritan faith went forth as an emancipating spirit into a much wider life.

In the contest for political freedom in England, a great victory was won in 1688 in the triumph of Parliament. What was done in New England reacted on affairs in England, and what happened in England influenced all of the English colonies in America. The Puritan influence also moved directly through the colonies along the Atlantic coast. Though

Virginia was founded by Royalists and promoted by Cavaliers and did not at first welcome Puritans, yet the time came when the Englishmen of that colony desired the same measure of political freedom as was enjoyed by the colonies in New England. Though the Church of England was dominant in Virginia, the men of that colony were moved to sympathize with the Puritans of New England in their political aspirations. The time came when Virginia and Massachusetts were linked strongly together in resisting an obstinate English king; and they united their Anglican and Puritan forces in the common cause.

When, in the first years of Massachusetts, the Puritans fortified Boston Harbor against the king of England, a far-sighted historian might have predicted ultimate American independence. When Massachusetts men rose in armed revolt against the royal governor Andros, having been summoned by the fateful beacon fire on the hilltop in Boston, the Revolutionary War became inevitable. How often a day of crisis seems to come suddenly! But how often it is the sudden expression of forces that have been accumulating for many years!

The war for American independence was not caused by the events of the years immediately preceding it, but by forces that had been growing for centuries.

It may seem like a long interval between the time when men kindled the fire on Beacon Hill in Boston to summon the colonial forces for armed revolt against Andros, and the time when the signal lanterns gleamed from the tower of the Old North Church in Boston in the night before the battle on Lexington Common. But during all those years, Puritan principles were adding their oil to the flame of American ideals and, in the dreams of men, a new nation was assuming a living form.

During those years, New England received a new spiritual stimulant such as had impelled many peoples toward a republican ideal of government. We have seen that Calvinism, though emphasizing the sovereignty of God, tended to promote democracy. A man who embraced this theology and who was convinced that he was the implement of the Almighty, felt that he had a dignity that was above that of any earthly ruler. In the presence of that faith, the king and the commoner were equal;

and earthly distinctions seemed of minor importance.

Under the leadership of Jonathan Edwards and George Whitefield, the religious revival called "The Great Awakening" swept over New England. This comes into our story not because of its religious meaning but because of its political significance. In the world's history the great movements for political freedom are linked with, and have usually resulted from, revivals of religion. When men gain a clear consciousness of being in vital relationship with the Almighty, it is hard to hold them in any kind of political subjection. At that time in New England, a fire of religious revival, whatever its form, would have communicated its flame to the spirit of political revolt. But "The Great Awakening" had a *dual* effect which could not have been predicted in its beginning.

That revival was promoted by two leaders who preached a severe form of Calvinism. Thousands of men were moved affirmatively and became more intensely Calvinistic. Thousands of other men were roused to antagonism to Calvinism in the intense form in which it

was preached. The revival led to controversy and the formation of conflicting parties in many churches.

This leads us to one of the strange paradoxes of history: that men often take different roads and yet reach the same goal. Calvinism, as preached in this revival, had the effect of leading many men to assert God's sovereignty and to believe themselves to be *His implements;* and so they were more ready to fight the king of England. It led many men to declare that man's free will is to be asserted rather than a divine decree, and this intensified their sense of the dignity of *human nature.* From this they, too, derived an intense love of political liberty; and they were quite as ready as were their Calvinistic neighbors to fight the king of England.

The outcome was that the Revolutionary War began in New England with its storm center in eastern Massachusetts, near Boston. It was in the very heart of Massachusetts Puritanism. The first blood to be shed by Puritan patriots was on their little village green, with a white meetinghouse, like a Greek temple, looking out upon it. Boston, in the military possession of the royal forces, was be-

sieged immediately by the men who had trained on many a New England village green.

Quaker Pennsylvania, Anglican Virginia, Catholic Maryland, and all the other colonies, of whatever tradition, were soon involved in a common cause. Together they won a victory for the faith that the power in men gives them the right of self-government.

As the Boston patriots were proceeding step by step, in a course from which they could not recede, some people still asked if the differences between England and America might not be healed. Men were resisting the Stamp Act and declaring that "taxation without representation is tyranny." Let us remember that, exactly five centuries before, the ancestors of these men had formed the English House of Commons, believing that the common people of England, who must bear much of the burden of taxation, should have representation in the government of England. The Stamp Act was, indeed, an incident and not of itself very important; but it involved the principles for which the liberty-loving people of England had contended all those centuries. In 1265 in England, and in 1765 in America, the principle was

the same, though five centuries lay between the dates.

There are historical writers who say that the American colonists ought to have made allowance for the bad temper of King George III, and that they precipitated the war without sufficient reason. In himself George III was not a very important figure, but he represented the spirit of tyranny under which people had suffered through long ages. If we look beyond the immediate circumstances of the war, we see not his figure alone, but, in shadowy outline, his predecessors in a long line, who had opposed the aspirations of the English people. And, in the background of that shadowy group, we see the sinister figures of all the tyrants who have oppressed the people of the world as they have contended for a larger share of freedom. The patriots were not fighting merely the obstinate king who, for the time being, sat on the throne of England. They were fighting the strongly intrenched principle of the divine right of kings.

Again there are historical writers who belittle the group of Boston patriots who really precipitated the war: writers who make light of

the "Boston Tea-Party," the "Boston Massacre," and the other incidents which caused such intense feeling. Of these patriots it is said that they were a little group, contending over small issues. The point of an arrow, also, is a little thing. But back of the point is the weight of the head which gives it momentum; and back of the head is the strength of the shaft; and back of the shaft are the feathers which, though extremely light, give the arrow its fidelity to its aim. Back of the whole arrow is the mighty hickory bow and the strength of the rawhide string, and the power of the body of the archer. Yes, the point of the arrow is a small thing; but, thus driven, it may pierce the armor of a tyrant and set a nation free.

As we look at the group of Boston patriots they are, indeed, like the point of the arrow; but momentum and strength are in their movement. The arrow is feathered with the dreams of all the lovers of humanity through the centuries; and it is driven by the power of the spirit of liberty which has impelled every contest on behalf of human rights in all the world.

If you draw a circle around Boston Common, the circle having a radius of twenty-five

miles, you will enclose the scenes of many romantic events of American history. It is a small area, but the principles associated with it are as wide as the world.

The New England Puritans experimented with their principles to see if they could really be applied to life. They invented institutions and gave utterance to their convictions. America has multiplied the essential institutions of the Puritans, those which expressed their faith in the powers of human personality. In the political life of America, this Puritan faith has been echoed and reëchoed. The clearly uttered political faith of John Wise of Ipswich, the patriot who was jailed for resisting the tyrant Andros, furnished watchwords to Revolutionary soldiers even as the Scriptures furnished slogans to Cromwell's Ironsides. And John Wise added to the lucidity of the utterances of Thomas Hooker and helped to transmit Puritan principles to the men who, in shaping the American Republic, uttered clearly our American ideals. Jefferson's utterances of his own political convictions bear evidence of the vital influence of these Puritan pioneer thinkers.

Not only like a contagion, by the contact of one man's mind with another, but also by the actual migration of individuals and groups of people, Puritan principles and institutions have been carried entirely across the continent and to the remotest corners of the Republic. Thomas Hooker's migration with the members of his congregation has been repeated scores of times. Though America has received large numbers of people from many lands, the ideals of New England have been truly like a leaven, "leavening the whole lump."

When charters were granted to Massachusetts and Connecticut, it was comparatively easy to define their eastern boundaries and to start their westward lines. But each charter bestows a strip of land extending to the Pacific Ocean. In the light of the westward migrations of New England people, such far-reaching lines seem almost prophetic. Men of those colonies did indeed migrate toward the setting sun until they had come to the Pacific Ocean. Salem, Oregon, is not just a repetition of a name, for it has a real heritage from the settlement where John Winthrop first set foot on American soil.

All across the continent there are communities which bear the marks of the Puritan origin of their founders. There are schoolhouses, town houses and churches which are reminiscent of the typical New England village. The expressions of the Greek culture, seen in New England architecture, have been multiplied widely in American life.

As a consequence of many generations of development, American life has come to be an incarnation of the principle of self-government. It has required many centuries to get away from the Roman principle of government which dominated Europe in the time of Wyclif. If men who followed the Roman method were in control of the territory of the American Republic, how would they govern it? They would establish a strong central government in the capital of the nation, and send out governors to enforce Roman law even to the remotest rim of the territory. But the American ideal, after long development, is dominant here. From the far corners of the nation, from Maine and Oregon and Texas and Florida, representatives, chosen by the common people, are sent to the nation's capital. The representatives

of every state of the Union constitute the central government. That contrast, between the Roman idea and the American idea, can thus be stated in a few words, but it is of tremendous importance. It makes the difference between ancient autocracy, which checked the development of human power, and modern democracy, which gives human personality its opportunity for development.

Through the political progress of the movement of English Puritanism and through the principles of New England Puritans, America has received a priceless heritage. Though American ideals are not fully realized, they impel us toward further progress. The traveler in the night does not reach the stars, but they guide him on his way. Our ideals are exalted, and our journey forward is age-long. But if we travel forward bravely, guided by ideals which even the darkest night cannot remove from the sky, it means that we are the worthy successors of pioneers gone before, and that we mark more clearly the way for those who shall come after.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

A18950

Saunderson, Henry Hallam, b.1871.
Puritan principles and American ideals [by]
5 Henry Hallam Saunderson ... Boston, Chicago,
The Pilgrim press [c1930]
xi, 225p. 20cm.

1. Puritans. 2. U.S.--Civilization.
I. Title.

A1950

CCSC/sr